DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 437 LI 000 611

An Evaluation of the New York State Library's Pilot Program in the Facsimile Transmission of Library Materials.

Nelson Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency-New York State Library, Albany. Div. of Library Development.

Pub Date Feb 68

Note-81p.; A summary of this report appears in ED 022 501.

Available from-Commerce Offset, 657 Commerce Street, Thornwood, N.Y. 10594 ($4.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Facsimile Transmission, Feasibility Studies, *Library Cooperation, Library Materials, *Library Networks, Library Planning, Library Programs, *Library Services, Pilot Projects, Use Studies

Identifiers-*FACTS, New York, New York State Library

The New York State Library's pilot program in facsimile transmission of library materials (FACTS) began on January 20, 1967 and operated until March 31, 1968. The purpose of the network was to provide researchers throughout the State with rapid access to major library collections. The program included a network of fifteen libraries or "FACTS stations", seven of which had sending and receiving facilities and eight of which had receiving equipment. In order to qualify for FACTS service, patrons had to be at least 18 and the request had to be one of a "serious and urgent nature", not exceeding 12 pages of facsimile copy. This study involved (1) a technical evaluation of facsimile transmission equipment and (2) an evaluation of the service merits of FACTS network. Information on the operations of the program was gathered on data sheets (copy appended) maintained at the State Library for every request received, and interviews with staff at the FACTS stations. This report recommends that (1) the network be discontinued after March 31, 1968, and (2) State Library continue to give special attention to serious and urgent requests but within context of its NYSILL program. The report emphasizes that although it is recommended that FACTS be discontinued, the results of this experiment do not prove that a facsimile transmission network will never be feasible or desirable in the state. (Author/CC)

ED030437

LI000611

ERIC/CLIS
JUL 3 '68
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

AN EVALUATION OF
THE NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY'S
PILOT PROGRAM
IN THE FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

LI000611

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY New York State
Library
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

AN EVALUATION OF
THE NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY'S
PILOT PROGRAM
IN THE FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

Nelson Associates, Incorporated

February 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This report is submitted solely for the information and benefit of the client to whom it is addressed.

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED • 845 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022 • 212 HA 1-3110

February 26, 1968

Miss Jean L. Connor, Director
Division of Library Development
The New York State Library
Albany, New York

Dear Miss Connor:

We are pleased to submit herewith our report on the operations of The New York State Library's pilot program in the facsimile transmission of library materials, and our evaluation of the desirability of continuing this project on a more permanent basis beyond its scheduled termination at the end of next month. We hope this document will be a useful tool in planning for the further development of a viable statewide reference and research interlibrary loan network. Moreover, the raw data generated in the course of our investigations should provide you and your colleagues with a rich source of additional information for planning purposes.

Nelson Associates' monitoring of this experimental facsimile project has extended over a ten-month period, from the beginning of the network's operations on January 20, 1967, until the cut-off date for the preparation of our report, November 30, 1967. Throughout this time, we have benefited from the advice and assistance of the staff of the Interlibrary Loan Unit at the State Library. Their enthusiasm for the facsimile program, even in the midst of disappointing setbacks, should not go unrecognized. We would also like to express our gratitude to the representatives at each of the 13 other libraries around the state that participated in the pilot project for their cooperation in collecting data, maintaining records and aiding our assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the network's operations.

The New York State Library's attempt to speed the interloan process for urgent and important requests by installing an extensive statewide network of facsimile transmission devices in public and private institutions represents a major breakthrough in the long-term development of an efficient procedure for the rapid communication of unique and special materials. We are happy to have had the opportunity to survey so important an undertaking.

Very truly yours,

Nelson Associates

NELSON ASSOCIATES, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter I INTRODUCTION 1

DESCRIPTION OF FACTS PILOT PROGRAM 1

OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY 3

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION 4

DEFINITIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF DATA 6

FACTS Requests 6
Monitoring Period 7

Chapter II OPERATIONS OF THE FACTS NETWORK 9

VOLUME OF REQUESTS RECEIVED 9

VOLUME OF POSTCARD RETURNS 11

CHARACTERISTICS OF FACTS REQUESTS 11

Patron Status for FACTS Requests 11
Use of Requested Material by Patron Status 13
Subject Material of FACTS Requests 14
Request Transmission Sites for FACTS Requests 15
Types of Originating Libraries by Request Transmission Sites 20

FACTS REQUESTS SEARCHED IN THE FACTS NETWORK 24

Status of Requests at the State Library 24
Referrals 26
Number of Requests Filled in Network 32
Unfilled FACTS Requests 32

RECEIPT OF FILLED FACTS REQUEST BY PATRON 35

Reception Site for FACTS Requests 35
Means of Delivery to Originating Libraries 36
Time Lapse Between Patron Request and Receipt of FACTS Material 37

PATRON REACTION TO FACTS 41

Patron Reaction to Speed of Service 41
Patrons' Suggestions for Improvement in Service 41

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

		Page
Chapter III	COSTS OF THE FACTS PROGRAM	46
Chapter IV	EVALUATION OF THE FACTS NETWORK	49
Appendix A	FACTS AND NYSILL DATA SHEET	58
Appendix B	GUIDELINES FOR THE FACTS AND NYSILL PILOT PROJECTS IN NEW YORK STATE	59
Appendix C	FACTS POSTCARD-QUESTIONNAIRE	72

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	Volume of FACTS Requests	10
Table 2	Patron Status for FACTS Requests	12
Table 3	Use of Transmitted Material by Patron Status of User	14
Table 4	Subject Material of FACTS Requests	16
Table 5	Request Transmission Sites for FACTS Requests	17
Table 6	Types of Originating Libraries by Request Transmission Sites	22
Table 7	Status of FACTS Requests at the State Library	25
Table 8	Number of Referrals for 1,192 FACTS Requests Referred Beyond the State Library	27
Table 9	Percentage of Requests Filled at Each Stage of Referral	28
Table 10	Number of FACTS Requests Received at Different Referral Libraries	29
Table 11	Status of FACTS Requests at Referral Libraries	31
Table 12	FACTS Stations as Stages in the Referral Process	32
Table 13	Number of Requests Filled at Each Stage in FACTS Network as Percent of all FACTS Requests for Each Time Period	33
Table 14	Reasons FACTS Requests Were Not Filled	34
Table 15	Means by Which Originating Libraries Received Filled FACTS Requests	38
Table 16	Time Lapse Between Patron Request and Receipt of Material	40
Table 17	Patrons' Responses to Question "Would this service be equally useful if it took 2 or 3 days longer to receive the material?"	42
Table 18	Suggestions for Improvement of Service	43
Table 19	Participation Grants to FACTS Stations	47
Table 20	Estimated Costs of the FACTS Program, January 20-November 30, 1967	48

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This Chapter describes the operations of the FACTS pilot program, cites the objectives of this study, reviews the methods of data collection employed and provides certain definitions that governed the use of the data collected.

DESCRIPTION OF FACTS PILOT PROGRAM

The New York State Library's pilot program in the facsimile transmission of library materials (known as "FACTS") began on January 20, 1967 and will operate until March 31, 1968. The program started with two libraries using facsimile transmission equipment and eventually included a network of fiften libraries, or "FACTS stations." Seven of these stations have both sending and receiving facilities, while the other eight have only receiving equipment. The 15 stations and their respective capabilities are:

1. The New York State Library (Albany)
   sending and receiving

2. The New York Public Library Research Libraries (New York)
   sending and receiving

3. Cornell University (Ithaca)
   sending and receiving

4. Buffalo and Erie County Public Library (Buffalo)
   sending and receiving

5. Monroe County Library System (Rochester)
   sending and receiving

6. Columbia University (New York)
   sending and receiving

7. The New York Academy of Medicine (New York)
   sending and receiving

8. Nassau Library System (Hempstead)
   receiving

9. Suffolk Cooperative Library System
   (Patchogue)
   receiving

10. Westchester Library System
    (Mt. Vernon)
    receiving

11. Mid-Hudson Libraries (Poughkeepsie)
    receiving

12. Mid-York Library System (Utica)
    receiving

13. State University of New York at
    Albany
    receiving

14. State University of New York
    College at Potsdam
    receiving

15. State University of New York at
    Binghamton
    receiving

On January 20, 1967, the New York State Library and The New York Public Library Research Libraries initiated the FACTS program. Four additional stations--Cornell, Buffalo and Erie County, Monroe County and SUNY College at Potsdam--began operations on February 10. During the last week of March, five more stations--Suffolk, Westchester, Mid-Hudson, Mid-York, and SUNY at Albany--were added to the network, and on April 20 a twelfth station--Nassau Library System--became operational. During the first half of June, Columbia and SUNY at Binghamton joined the network and in mid-January, 1968, the fifteenth station--at The New York Academy of Medicine-- was incorporated.

The FACTS network, with its 15 stations, was designed to provide researchers throughout the state with rapid access to major collections of library materials by means of facsimile transmission equipment. At the outset, the stated aim of the program was to fill requests within 24 hours.

In order to qualify for FACTS service, the patron has to be at least 18 years old and the request must be of a "serious and urgent nature" that does not exceed 12 pages of facsimile copy.

Any public or private library in New York State can initiate a FACTS request for one of its eligible patrons. After determining that it is unable to fill a request meeting the above criteria, the library usually transmits the request--by telephone or teletype--to the nearest public library system headquarters or FACTS station. If this second library is not able to supply the material from its collection, it relays the request to the State Library. Requests can. of course, also originate at this second library.[1] When the requested material is available at the State Library, the library transmits a photocopy of the material via facsimile equipment to the FACTS station that either originated the request or is nearest the library that originated the request. A request that cannot be filled at the State Library is referred by teletype to one or more of the six other libraries with facsimile sending equipment--The New York Public Library Research Libraries, Cornell, Buffalo and Erie County, Monroe County, Columbia and The New York Academy of Medicine. A bibliographic search of the FACTS request at the State Library determines the pattern of referral. When one of the referral libraries finds it is able to fill the request, it transmits a photocopy of the material to the FACTS station that either originated the request or is nearest the originating library. If the request was not initiated at a FACTS station, the facsimile copy is either delivered or sent to the originating library by the FACTS station or the originating library itself arranges for the pick-up of the copy.

The facsimile transmission equipment of two manufacturers is being used during the pilot program. Columbia and SUNY at Binghamton have Alden equipment and the 13 other stations are utilizing Stewart-Warner equipment. In January, 1968, a piece of Alden equipment was transferred from Columbia to SUNY College at Potsdam. At the beginning of the program, copy from Buffalo and Erie County, Cornell, Monroe County or The New York Public Library Research Libraries was first transmitted to the State Library and then re-transmitted to the appropriate receiving station. On April 1, switching capability which made it possible to transmit facsimile copy directly from the sending station to the receiving station was installed in Albany for the Stewart-Warner equipment. However, copy exchanged between a station using Alden equipment and any other station in the FACTS network (excepting the State Library) still has to be re-transmitted at the State Library.

OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY

The New York State Library commissioned two separate evaluations of the operations of the pilot program: one, a technical evaluation of the facsimile transmission equipment and the other, an evaluation of the services merits of the FACTS network. Results of the latter study, conducted by Nelson Associates, are presented in this report.[2]

---

[1] When a request is searched at two libraries before being sent to the State Library, the first library is designated as the originating library and the second library is termed the request transmission site. When a request is searched at only one library before the State Library, that one library is both the originating library and the request transmission site for the request.

Nelson Associates outlined the major objectives of its study as follows:

1. to analyze and evaluate the pilot experience and ascertain the feasibility, from the standpoint of library service rendered, of an ongoing facsimile transmission network for the libraries of New York State;
2. to determine the extent to which the number of facsimile sending and/or receiving devices at each participating library was adequate for the transmission volume experienced;
3. to establish whether, in the various regions of the state, the location of the pilot project's receiving units is appropriately related to the process of referral and the varying amounts of facsimile copy received by libraries in the area; and,
4. to ascertain whether the State Library's grants to participating institutions fully covered their additional clerical and copying machine rental costs during the pilot period.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

It was understood at the outset that the proper establishment of network operations, including provisions for the collection of pertinent data, at each of the facsimile sites was the responsibility of The New York State Library. Accordingly, guidance from Nelson Associates in the preliminary operations of the facsimile network was limited to consultations with the State Library staff supervising the project. During this initial stage of the study, record-keeping operations at the State Library were reviewed. In March, Nelson Associates participated in the State Library's meeting with representatives of the FACTS stations to finalize the nature and method of network record-keeping.

The primary source of information on the operations of the program was a data sheet maintained at the State Library for every FACTS requests received. (The data sheet is reproduced in Appendix A.) These records, along with information gathered from librarians at each

---

[2] The technical evaluation was assigned to one of the State Library's own staff. Only preliminary findings from the report were available at the time of this writing.

FACTS station and from a sample of patrons who used the service, formed the basis of the evaluation outlined in the first objective of the study. Investigations in behalf of the second, third and fourth objectives relied heavily on interviews with staff at each of the FACTS stations.

The data collection procedures described below were followed throughout the monitoring period. Thereafter, data collection was somewhat modified.

The data sheet for each FACTS request contained, in addition to bibliographic information on the material requested, the following information as provided by the originating library: patron status of the requester (faculty, student or "other"), name and address of the originating library, time and date the request was submitted, medium by which it was submitted (telephone, teletype, mail, in person or "other"), status of the request at the originating library, and the subject code[3] or Dewey decimal classification number assigned to the request. If the request was searched at another library before being sent to the State Library, this second library was asked to provide data on the time, date and media for their receipt of the request as well as the status of the request in their collection. This information was then sent to the State Library, usually by teletype. In a few instances, FACTS requests were received at the State Library in person or by telephone.

The State Library staff recorded all of this information about each request on a data sheet, adding the time, date and media for their receipt of the request and the status of the request at the State Library. If the request was referred to one or more libraries in the FACTS network, similar information was recorded concerning its receipt and status at each library. When the request was filled, the name of the FACTS station receiving the facsimile copy was added to the data sheet, as well as the time and date of the transmission and the number of pages copied.

In the early phases of the FACTS pilot program, originating libraries were asked to collect data on filled requests. Specifically, they were to record the date and time they received the facsimile copy and the date and time the patron obtained the requested material. This information was entered on a data sheet at the originating library and then sent to Albany to be matched with the State Library's data sheet for that particular request. After following this procedure for several months, it was decided that while originating libraries should continue to collect data on the request when it was submitted, Nelson Associates would collect data about the receipt of facsimile copy. In order to secure this information, a postcard-questionnaire was designed to be answered in part by the librarian at the originating library and part by the patron. (The postcard is reproduced in Appendix C.) Questions on the postcard included the times and dates the material was received at the library and by the patron, as well as the patron's reactions to the FACTS program. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed in April to all FACTS stations with instructions that one should be attached to any facsimile copy received. When the postcard had been completed by the librarian and the patron, it was to be mailed to Nelson Associates.

---

[3] A list of 55 codes to be used in classifying requests according to subject material was drawn up and distributed by the State Library. (See Appendix B, page 67 of "Guidelines for the FACTS and NYSILL Pilot Projects in New York State.")

DEFINITIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF DATA

Two definitions governed the use of data that were collected during the operation of the FACTS pilot program. One outlines what a FACTS request is; the other specifies the length of the monitoring period.

FACTS Requests

A definition for FACTS requests was established in order to clearly distinguish them from requests studied under another pilot program monitored by Nelson Associates. On March 22, 1967, The New York State Library instituted a second and allied experimental program--The New York State Interlibrary Loan Network (NYSILL). Under this program, interlibrary loan requests of a serious nature that are received at the State Library, and cannot be filled there, are referred on to one or more of twelve major resource libraries in the state. The six sending stations, other then the State Library, in the FACTS program (Buffalo and Erie County, Columbia, Cornell, Monroe County, The New York Academy of Medicine and The New York Public Library Research Libraries) also serve as referral libraries for the NYSILL program. Filled NYSILL requests, either in the form of the material itself or a photocopy of the requested item, are sent to the originating library by mail by the filling library.

The simultaneous operations of the FACTS and NYSILL pilot programs resulted in some requests being treated as what might be termed "FACTS - NYSILL" requests; that is, legitimate FACTS requests were sometimes referred to a library without facsimile sending equipment and filled at that library by mailed photocopy. Alternatively, some requests which did not actually meet FACTS specifications--for page limitations, for example-- were handled as FACTS requests at the State Library and were referred to FACTS sending libraries, although these libraries treated them as if they were NYSILL requests if they were able to fill them.

The requests analyzed for this report are those which were:

a) filled by facsimile copy;

b) not filled because they were unavailable in the network or were cancelled, but which met the specifications for FACTS requests and were searched in libraries with FACTS equipment; and

c) filled by photocopy rather than facsimile because, according to a notation on the data sheet, the facsimile transmission equipment was not in operation when the copy was to be received.[4]

Excluded from these tabulations are requests that originated as FACTS requests but were filled by photocopy or bound volume, because the material requested exceeded the 12-page limit for FACTS requests,[5] the sending library did not have FACTS equipment, or the request was filled at the State Library for an Albany-area patron and, therefore, facsimile transmission equipment was not used.[6]

Monitoring Period

Initially, the FACTS pilot program was to terminate on July 29, 1967. According to this schedule, the final evaluation of the FACTS network was to be based on data through July 29. By June, however, it became apparent that the period of data collection and evaluation of the pilot program should be extended beyond the July termination date. Such an extension was deemed necessary since the full complement of FACTS stations, as then planned,[7] was not in operation until June, which was several months behind schedule. If the program were terminated at the end of July, the final evaluation would be based on less than two months' experience with the full network. In addition, it was felt that the value of the FACTS program for academic users would not have been adequately tested.

---

[4] These 32 requests are included since they represent the kind of mechanical failure that would occur in an ongoing facsimile transmission program.

[5] Although this is the reason some requests were not filled by facsimile copy, there were, in fact, other requests that were filled by facsimile copy that exceeded 12 pages.

[6] For these 7 Albany requests, the State Library was viewed as acting as the last clearinghouse for local requests in the same manner that systems' headquarters and FACTS stations filled requests from their immediate area which are not included in these analyses because they never entered the FACTS network.

[7] The fifteenth station--The New York Academy of Medicine--was not a part of network design until the fall of the year and was not operational until mid-January 1968.

Acting on these considerations, The New York State Library extended the pilot program to March 31, 1968, the end of the state fiscal year. The final evaluation of the program as an ongoing network was then set for February, 1968 in order to allow sufficient time for contract renewals beyond March 31 if that proved to be desirable. The revised monitoring period, covering all data collection on the program, was to be extended as long as possible in order to include the greatest amount of data while still meeting the February deadline.

Near the end of December, all data sheets at the State Library were reviewed and the latest date for which all requests had been completed was set as the last day included in the data tabulation and analyses. ("Completed requests" and "incomplete requests" are terms used by the State Library staff to differentiate requests that are no longer active from those still being searched in the network. Completed requests are those that have been filled plus those that have not been filled because they are either not available in the network or have been cancelled. Incomplete requests are those which are still being searched at either the State Library or a referral site. Incomplete requests have been excluded from this study because they would tend to distort some of the data. For example, in an analysis on the number of referrals made for FACTS requests, incomplete requests still in the early stages of referral would overstate the incidence of requests referred only once and understate the incidence of requests referred more than once. In addition, incomplete requests will not necessarily continue to be considered FACTS requests after they are completed; some may be filled as NYSILL requests.) Accordingly, November 30 was established as the last day of the monitoring of the program. The monitoring period therefore became the ten-month period from January 20 to November 30, 1967. One analysis in this report on the volume of FACTS requests received at the State Library--includes requests received through December 21. Since 22% of the 398 requests received between December 1 and December 21 were incomplete when data for this report were tabulated, these 398 requests were not included in other analyses.

Data from the monitoring period exclude effects of the role of The New York Academy of Medicine in the FACTS program since the Academy was not added to the network until January 19, 1968.

The data collected on FACTS requests have been tabulated and analyzed according to the following ten time periods: the period from January 20, the beginning of the FACTS pilot program, to March 21, the last day before the start of the NYSILL pilot program; the next eight one-month periods from the 22nd of one month to the 21st of the next month, starting March 22 and ending on November 21; and the period from November 22nd to November 30th. When comparing data for the different time periods, it should be borne in mind that the first time period covers about two months, the next eight time periods are for about one month each and the tenth time period covers about a week.

The remaining chapters of this report discuss the operations of the FACTS program, its costs and the evaluations of the network.

Chapter II

OPERATIONS OF THE FACTS NETWORK

VOLUME OF REQUESTS RECEIVED

Between January 20 and December 21, 1967, a total of 3,580 FACTS requests, as previously defined in this report, were received at the State Library. Since the ten time periods do not include the same number of days, it is most meaningful to study changes in the number of requests entering the network by comparing the average number of requests received per day during each period. The average daily number of requests received at the State Library, for each of the ten different time periods, is shown in Table 1.

Between the first and third time periods the average daily number of FACTS requests more than doubled. This increase in volume may be at least partly explained by the increased availability of service from added FACTS stations. As noted earlier, for the initial 15 working days of the first time period only the State Library and The New York Public Library Research Libraries were operating; during the remainder of this period a total of six stations were in operation. Five more stations were added near the start of the second period and on April 20, at the very end of the second period, a twelfth joined the network. Therefore, it was not until the third period that these 12 stations, which are among the heaviest users of FACTS, operated throughout a full time period. An analysis presented later in this report shows that 91% of all FACTS requests received during the monitoring period came from these stations.

In the fourth time period, 5/22-6/21, the daily volume of FACTS requests dropped to less than half that of the third time period. This low volume of requests continued throughout the summer months and was not offset by the addition of two stations at Columbia University and SUNY at Binghamton, in June. Two possible explanations of this trend are (1) the decreased need for research materials during school and business vacation periods, and (2) disinterest in the service due to unsatisfactory results (e.g., poor copy, slow service) experienced in the first months of the program.

For the eighth time period, at the beginning of the full academic term, the average daily number of FACTS requests increased beyond the highest previous level. In the ninth period, the average daily volume went still higher, but declined slightly in the tenth period. The actual decline may be greater than that shown in Table 1 since the number of FACTS requests reported for the tenth period may be somewhat overstated inasmuch as 22% of those received between December 1 and

Table 1

VOLUME OF FACTS REQUESTS

Period	Total Number of Requests Received	Number of Working Days in Time Period*	Average Number of Requests Received Per Day
1/20-3/21	329	42	7.8
3/22-4/21	349	23	15.2
4/22-5/21	378	20	18.9
5/22-6/21	170	22	7.7
6/22-7/21	206	21	9.8
7/22-8/21	226	21	10.8
8/22-9/21	191	22	8.7
9/22-10/21	478	20	23.9
10/22-11/21	673	22	30.6
11/22-12/21	580	21	27.6
All Periods Combined	3,580	234	15.3

---

*For this analysis, the number of working days during any time period is the number of weekdays, Monday through Friday, minus any holidays. This corresponds to the number of days the FACTS equipment at the State Library was in operation and the staff was working on FACTS requests.

December 21 were incomplete when they were counted for this report and some of these may have subsequently been filled as NYSILL requests.

The remaining analyses in this report include data only through November 30 which, as noted earlier, is the last day of the monitoring period. The number of FACTS requests received at the State Library during the monitoring period from January 20 to November 30, 1967 totals 3,187.

VOLUME OF POSTCARD RETURNS

When the postcard-questionnaires that Nelson Associates distributed to FACTS stations were returned, they were matched by request number to their corresponding data sheets at the State Library. Together, the postcard and data sheet provided a complete history of a filled FACTS request.

For this report, 772 of the returned postcards were matched to data sheets. A sizable number could not be used because of missing, incomplete or inaccurate request numbers which made it impossible to determine which request the postcard was for. The 772 postcards that were used represent 35% of all FACTS requests filled from the third time period, when the postcards were distributed, through the tenth time period. (Since the postcard was attached to facsimile copy received at FACTS stations, only patrons whose requests were filled had the opportunity to complete a questionnaire.)

CHARACTERISTICS OF FACTS REQUESTS

Patron Status for FACTS Requests

The status of patrons initiating the 3,187 FACTS requests is shown in Table 2, which has been percentaged using only the categories of student, faculty, other and ineligible.[8] This procedure assumes that the requests that had no patron status recorded (about 9% of the total) are divided among the four patron categories in the same proportions as those requests where the patron's status was identified.

According to the data in this table, about 50% of all FACTS requests received at the State Library between January 20 and November 30, 1967 were from students, 30% were from faculty members and 20% were from "others." It should be emphasized that these statistics are for requests, which do not necessarily correlate on a one-to-one basis with numbers of patrons, since one patron can submit several requests. In other words, the data in this table cannot be interpreted to mean that, among all patrons using this service, students outnumbered faculty

---

[8] An ineligible patron is defined as one under 18 years of age or one who is an inmate of a mental or penal institution.

Table 2

PATRON STATUS FOR FACTS REQUESTS

Period	Student	Faculty	Other	Ineligible	No Record	Total
1/20-3/21	46.1%	45.7%	8.2%	-		100.0%
	(107)	(106)	(19)		(97)	(329)
3/22-4/21	56.9	21.5	21.5	-		99.9
	(177)	(67)	(67)		(38)	(349)
4/22-5/21	39.4	37.1	23.4	-		99.9
	(138)	(130)	(82)		(28)	(378)
5/22-6/21	19.4	50.3	30.3	-		100.0
	(30)	(78)	(47)		(15)	(170)
6/22-7/21	37.5	30.4	32.1	-		100.0
	(69)	(56)	(59)		(22)	(206)
7/22-8/21	65.4	22.4	12.2	-		100.0
	(134)	(46)	(25)		(21)	(226)
8/22-9/21	11.0	28.3	60.7	-		100.0
	(19)	(49)	(105)		(18)	(191)
9/22-10/21	50.8	23.6	25.4	0.2		100.0
	(234)	(109)	(117)	(1)	(17)	(478)
10/22-11/21	58.3	32.1	9.6	-		100.0
	(377)	(208)	(62)		(26)	(673)
11/22-11/30	64.0	22.3	13.7	-		100.0
	(112)	(39)	(24)		(12)	(187)
All Periods Combined	48.3%	30.7%	21.0%	-		100.0%
	(1,397)	(888)	(607)	(1)	(294)	(3,187)

members and "other" patrons; the data only shows that more of the requests came from students than from the other two categories.

There seems to be no established division of requests by patron status from one time period to the next. One trend that does emerge from this data, however, is the influence of the academic term on the number of requests submitted by students. The two periods with a noticeably lower percentage of requests from students are 5/22 to 6/21, the period after the spring term, and 8/22 to 9/21, the period after the summer term. The unusually high proportion of requests from "other" during the 8/22-9/21 period (60% compared to 20% for the ten periods as a whole) may be at least partially due to the changing status of patrons --that is, patrons who formerly reported themselves as students might have been listed as "other" in the period between academic terms.

Use of Requested Material by Patron Status

The FACTS postcard-questionnaire asked the patron to indicate how he intended to use the material he received--for business or professional activities, academic course work, independent research or other purposes. Table 3 presents a tabulation of this information according to the patron status of the user.[9]

It should be noted that the number of responses for the four categories of use, plus the no answers, do not add to the totals given in the table. This is due to the fact that a patron could cite more than one intended use for the material. For example, both independent research and academic course work might be checked on a card. In such cases, independent research and academic course work are each counted as a separate response although the total number of returns remains unchanged.

---

[9] Patrons represented in the postcard returns appear to constitute a reasonably fair sample of those submitting the 3,187 FACTS requests studied in this report. A comparison of the distribution of patron status in the two groups shows that the postcard sample is somewhat biased toward students (5.8% more in the postcards than for all FACTS requests) and against faculty (4.4% less in the postcards than for all requests).

Table 3

USE OF TRANSMITTED MATERIAL BY PATRON STATUS OF USER

Use of Material	Student	Faculty	Other	No Record	All Patrons
Academic Course Work	78.9% (299)	19.0% (35)	14.6% (20)	(15)	49.7% (369)
Independent Research	27.7 (105)	62.0 (114)	28.5 (39)	(18)	37.2 (276)
Business or Professional Activities	1.1 (4)	18.5 (34)	56.2 (77)	(10)	16.8 (125)
Other	1.6 (6)	7.1 (13)	8.0 (11)	(1)	4.2 (31)
No Answer	(11)	(4)	(15)	(1)	(31)
Total*	109.3% (390)	106.6% (188)	107.3% (152)	(42)	107.9% (772)

---

* Total of percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses (a single request may have more than one use).

As shown in the table, half of the filled requests were intended for use in academic course work, 37% were for independent research, 17% were for business or professional activities and 4% were for other purposes. Not surprisingly, students accounted for the greatest number of requests for material for academic course work, faculty members made the most requests for material for independent research (with students a close second) and "other" patrons submitted the most requests for material for business and professional activities.

Subject Material of FACTS Requests

Originating libraries were asked to assign subject codes to FACTS requests beginning in late March, when the NYSILL program started. These codes, which were to be assigned from a list of 55 subject categories provided by the State Library, were to be used to identify the subject material of FACTS requests.[10] Many requests received at the State Library after March, however, did not include a subject code. It was understood that, in at least some cases, requests were uncoded because the material could not be classified according to any of the 55 available subject categories. Since the Dewey decimal system provides complete subject coverage, originating libraries were asked in September to supply the Dewey number for each FACTS request instead of the code.

---

[10] For NYSILL requests, this subject code also indicated which referral center should be sent the request if it could not be filled at the State Library.

In this analysis of the subject material of FACTS requests, the subject codes and Dewey decimal numbers have been grouped into the following 12 categories: social sciences, science and mathematics, psychology, education, engineering and technology, medicine, history, fine arts, English literature and languages, foreign literature and languages, philosophy and religion, and others.

Only 51% of the 3,187 FACTS requests analyzed in this report had either a subject code or a Dewey decimal number assigned to them. None of the requests in the first time period were coded because this was not a requirement of the program until the beginning of the second time period on March 22; in the nine other time periods (that had a total of 2,858 requests), from 30% to 50% of the requests were without subject codes. Although gaps in the State Library's list of subject codes were suspected to account partially for the large proportion of no answers on subject material, the incidence of no answers is slightly greater in the three periods following the introduction of the use of Dewey numbers than in the six time periods before (45% vs. 41%).

In the statistics presented in Table 4 on the subject material of FACTS requests, the number of requests that were actually coded for each of the 12 subject categories and the number of no answers (the uncoded requests) are shown as a percentage of all requests received during each time period. No assumption has been made about the subject material of these uncoded requests. The coded requests cannot be used as an indication of the probable division by subject category for the uncoded requests because, in six of the nine time periods studied, at least some of the no answers could represent subject areas that were missing from the State Library's list.

The proportion of FACTS requests in each of the subject categories varied quite considerably from one time period to the next. For the nine time periods as a whole, the three subject categories with the greatest number of FACTS requests are, in descending order, social sciences (11%), science and mathematics (9%), and psychology (8%).

Request Transmission Sites for FACTS Requests[11]

Table 5 gives the request transmission sites for the 3,187 FACTS requests received at the State Library between January 20 and November 30, 1967. Thirteen of the 14 FACTS stations operating as of

---

[11] In this analysis, The New York State Library is considered as the request transmission site for requests from state government personnel and Albany-area libraries that could not be filled at the State Library and were, therefore, referred into the FACTS network.

Table 4

SUBJECT MATERIAL OF FACTS REQUESTS*

Period	Social Sciences	Science and Mathematics	Psychology	Education	Engineering and Technology	Medicine	History	Fin
3/22-4/21	10.0% (35)	8.9% (31)	12.9% (45)	3.2% (11)	3.7% (13)	6.6% (23)	8.0% (28)	4 (
4/22-5/21	4.8 (18)	6.1 (23)	14.8 (56)	4.8 (18)	3.2 (12)	4.8 (18)	2.4 (9)	4 (
5/22-6/21	5.9 (10)	9.4 (16)	8.8 (15)	11.8 (20)	4.1 (7)	- -	8.2 (14)	1
6/22-7/21	21.4 (44)	8.7 (18)	10.2 (21)	2.9 (6)	2.9 (6)	3.4 (7)	3.4 (7)	3
7/22-8/21	25.2 (57)	19.9 (45)	7.1 (16)	1.8 (4)	2.2 (5)	3.5 (8)	2.7 (6)	
8/22-9/21	9.9 (19)	24.1 (46)	3.7 (7)	0.5 (1)	6.3 (12)	3.1 (6)	1.6 (3)	1
9/22-10/21	16.5 (79)	8.6 (41)	6.1 (29)	5.9 (28)	11.1 (53)	5.9 (28)	2.3 (11)	5 (
10/22-11/21	5.8 (39)	4.2 (28)	4.8 (32)	6.8 (46)	2.1 (14)	4.5 (30)	1.9 (13)	1 (
11/22-11/30	5.9 (11)	3.7 (7)	3.2 (6)	8.6 (16)	10.7 (20)	- -	2.1 (4)	4
All Periods Combined	10.9% (312)	8.9% (255)	7.9% (227)	5.2% (150)	5.0% (142)	4.2% (120)	3.3% (95)	3 (

---

* NOTE: The subjects included in the twelve subject categories are as follows:

SOCIAL SCIENCES - Geography, Economics, Transportation, Sociology, Africa, Middle East, Slavic, Japan, China, Anthr
Social Welfare, Social Science, Customs and Folklore.

SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS - Astronomy, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Zoology, Botany, Agriculture,

PSYCHOLOGY - Psychology.

EDUCATION - Education.

ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY - Engineering, Technology, Technical Reports, Business, Chemical Technology.

MEDICINE - Medicine.

HISTORY - French History, German History, English History, Italian History, Spanish History, Scandinavian History, Netherl
History, Ancient History, African History, North American History, European History.

FINE ARTS - Music, Fine Arts, Recreation, Architecture, Drawing and Decorative Art.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE - American Literature, English Literature, English and Old English.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE - Modern European Languages, Spanish Literature, Classics, French Literature, It

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION - Religion, Philosophy, Christian Churches and Sects, Ethics, Bible.

OTHER - Patents, Journalism, Foreign Law, Anglo/American Law, Bibliography, General Periodicals, Library Science, Ge

Table 4

UBJECT MATERIAL OF FACTS REQUESTS*

gineering and chnology	Medicine	History	Fine Arts	English Language and Literature	Foreign Languages and Literature	Philosophy and Religion	Other	No Answer	Total
3.7% (13)	6.6% (23)	8.0% (28)	4.0% (14)	4.3% (15)	- -	0.9% (3)	2.3% (8)	35.2% (123)	100.0% (349)
3.2 (12)	4.8 (18)	2.4 (9)	4.8 (18)	2.6 (10)	0.5% (2)	2.6 (10)	0.8 (3)	47.9 (181)	100.1 (378)
4.1 (7)	- -	8.2 (14)	1.2 (2)	6.5 (11)	0.6 (1)	1.2 (2)	1.2 (2)	41.2 (70)	100.1 (170)
2.9 (6)	3.4 (7)	3.4 (7)	3.9 (8)	2.9 (6)	0.5 (1)	1.9 (4)	1.0 (2)	36.9 (76)	100.0 (206)
2.2 (5)	3.5 (8)	2.7 (6)	- -	- -	0.4 (1)	0.4 (1)	- -	36.7 (83)	99.9 (226)
6.3 (12)	3.1 (6)	1.6 (3)	1.0 (2)	1.6 (3)	1.0 (2)	0.5 (1)	1.0 (2)	45.5 (87)	99.8 (191)
11.1 (53)	5.9 (28)	2.3 (11)	5.6 (27)	0.8 (4)	0.6 (3)	1.3 (6)	1.5 (7)	33.9 (162)	100.1 (478)
2.1 (14)	4.5 (30)	1.9 (13)	1.5 (10)	1.6 (11)	5.6 (38)	1.6 (1)	7.6 (51)	52.0 (350)	100.0 (673)
10.7 (20)	- -	2.1 (4)	4.8 (9)	2.1 (4)	2.1 (4)	0.5 (1)	8.6 (16)	47.6 (89)	99.9 (187)
5.0% (142)	4.2% (120)	3.3% (95)	3.1% (90)	2.2% (64)	1.8% (52)	1.4% (39)	3.2% (91)	42.7% (1,221)	99.8% (2,858)

Middle East, Slavic, Japan, China, Anthropology and Biology, Political Science, Southeast Asia, India/Pakistan, Public Service,

hemistry, Zoology, Botany, Agriculture, Paleontology, Pure Science, Earth Science.

, Business, Chemical Technology.

h History, Scandinavian History, Netherlands History, United States History, Canadian History, Latin American History, Classical
ory.
Art.
, English and Old English.
Literature, Classics, French Literature, Italian Literature, German Literature.
, Ethics, Bible.
General Periodicals, Library Science, General Societies.

Table 5

REQUEST TRANSMISSION SITES FOR FACTS REQUESTS

Period	SUNY College at Potsdam	Mid-Hudson Libraries	Nassau Library System	Mid-York Library System	Nioga Library System	The New York State Library	Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	Suffolk Cooperative Library System	Monroe County Library System
1/20-3/21	70.8% (233)	- -	- -	- -	- -	2.1% (7)	10.6% (35)	- -	6.1% (20)
3/22-4/21	43.3 (151)	30.7% (107)	2.3% (8)	0.9% (3)	0.6% (2)	9.2 (32)	4.9 (17)	0.3% (1)	0.3 (1)
4/22-5/21	26.2 (99)	25.7 (97)	13.5 (51)	8.7 (33)	0.3 (1)	7.7 (29)	0.5 (2)	4.2 (16)	2.9 (11)
5/22-6/21	27.1 (46)	30.0 (51)	11.2 (19)	7.6 (13)	- -	5.3 (9)	1.8 (3)	3.5 (6)	0.6 (1)
6/22-7/21	32.0 (66)	33.5 (69)	7.8 (16)	3.4 (7)	- -	10.2 (21)	0.5 (1)	2.9 (6)	1.5 (3)
7/22-8/21	53.5 (121)	4.9 (11)	5.8 (13)	12.4 (28)	1.3 (3)	7.5 (17)	0.4 (1)	1.3 (3)	0.9 (2)
8/22-9/21	18.3 (35)	34.6 (66)	18.8 (36)	12.6 (24)	0.5 (1)	0.5 (1)	0.5 (1)	1.0 (2)	0.5 (1)
9/22-10/21	27.8 (133)	31.0 (148)	9.8 (47)	7.1 (34)	1.0 (5)	0.4 (2)	0.2 (1)	5.9 (28)	7.9 (38)
10/22-11/21	22.0 (148)	20.2 (136)	12.0 (81)	6.5 (44)	19.8 (133)	0.3 (2)	5.6 (38)	4.6 (31)	1.9 (13)
11/22-11/30	32.6 (61)	17.1 (32)	12.3 (23)	3.2 (6)	14.4 (27)	- -	8.0 (15)	6.4 (12)	- -
All Periods Combined	34.3% (1,093)	22.5% (717)	9.2% (294)	6.0% (192)	5.4% (172)	3.8% (120)	3.6% (114)	3.3% (105)	2.8% (90)

Table 5
(continued)

Period	SUNY at Albany	Clarkson College of Technology	Cornell University	Westchester Library System	The New York Public Library Research Libraries	Ramapo Catskill Library System	SUNY at Binghamton	Brookhaven National Laboratories
1/20-3/21	- -	3.8% (12)	4.6% (15)	- -	1.8% (6)	- -	- -	- -
3/22-4/21	0.9% (3)	0.9 (3)	2.0 (7)	- -	2.0 (7)	1.1% (4)	0.3% (1)	- -
4/22-5/21	4.5 (17)	- -	2.4 (9)	- -	0.5 (2)	1.6 (6)	- -	0.5% (2)
5/22-6/21	- -	0.6 (1)	1.8 (3)	0.6% (1)	0.6 (1)	- -	2.9 (5)	4.7 (8)
6/22-7/21	- -	0.5 (1)	2.4 (5)	3.9 (8)	0.5 (1)	- -	- -	0.5 (1)
7/22-8/21	0.4 (1)	2.2 (5)	0.4 (1)	- -	0.4 (1)	3.5 (8)	4.0 (9)	- -
8/22-9/21	- -	3.7 (7)	1.6 (3)	1.6 (3)	5.2 (10)	- -	0.5 (1)	- -
9/22-10/21	3.3 (16)	2.3 (11)	1.5 (7)	1.5 (7)	- -	0.2 (1)	- -	- -
10/22-11/21	3.0 (20)	2.1 (14)	0.3 (2)	1.5 (10)	- -	- -	0.1 (1)	- -
11/22-11/30	2.1 (4)	1.1 (2)	1.6 (3)	- -	- -	- -	1.1 (1)	- -
All Periods Combined	1.9% (61)	1.8% (56)	1.7% (55)	0.9% (29)	0.9% (28)	0.6% (19)	0.6% (19)	0.3% (11)

Table 5
(continued)

Period	Union College	North Country Library System	Columbia University Medical Library	SUNY at Buffalo	Engineering Societies Library	Total
1/20-3/21	- -	0.3% (1)	- -	- -	- -	99.9% (329)
3/22-4/21	0.3% (1)	0.3 (1)	- -	- -	- -	100.3 (349)
4/22-5/21	0.8 (3)	- -	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (378)
5/22-6/21	1.2 (2)	- -	- -	0.6% (1)	- -	100.1 (170)
6/22-7/21	- -	- -	- -	- -	0.5% (1)	100.1 (206)
7/22-8/21	- -	- -	0.9% (2)	- -	- -	99.8 (226)
8/22-9/21	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	99.9 (191)
9/22-10/21	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	99.9 (478)
10/22-11/21	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	99.9 (673)
11/22-11/30	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	99.9 (187)
All Periods Combined	0.2% (6)	0.1% (2)	0.1% (2)	- (1)	- (1)	100.0% (3,187)

November 30 together accounted for about 92% of these requests. According to the State Library's records, the fourteenth station, at Columbia University, did not transmit any requests during the monitoring period. The remainder of the 3,187 requests came from Nioga Library System (172 requests), Clarkson College of Technology (56), Ramapo Catskill Library System (19), Brookhaven National Laboratories (11), Union College (6), North Country Library System (2), Columbia University Medical Library (2), SUNY at Buffalo (1) and the Engineering Societies Library (1).

Almost half (133 of 270) of the requests sent from non-FACTS stations were sent by the Nioga Library System during the ninth period. Requests from Nioga increased dramatically, from a total of 12 for the first eight time periods to 133 in the ninth period and 27 in the tenth which, it should be noted, has only six working days. This great increase in the last two periods placed Nioga fifth--after Potsdam, Mid-Hudson, Nassau and Mid-York--in the ranking of transmission sites according to the number of FACTS requests sent to the State Library during the ten months of monitoring.

There is a great disparity in the number of requests handled by each of the 13 FACTS stations. Potsdam (with 34% of all requests) and Mid-Hudson (with 22%)together transmitted more than half of the FACTS requests received between January 20 and November 30, 1967. By individual time period, these two stations always sent in 50% or more of all requests except during the 10/22-11/21 period when,as noted above, Nioga transmitted a significant proportion of the total number of requests received. After Potsdam and Mid-Hudson, the proportion of requests transmitted from any one station falls off considerably. In third place, Nassau transmitted 9% of all requests and, in fourth place, Mid-York transmitted 6%. The State Library, Buffalo and Erie County, Suffolk, Monroe County, SUNY at Albany and Cornell each accounted for from 1% to 4% of the total number of requests. Westchester, The New York Public Library Research Libraries and SUNY at Binghamton transmitted less than 1%. Clarkson, which does not have FACTS receiving equipment, sent in more requests than Cornell, Westchester, The New York Public Library Research Libraries or SUNY at Binghamton. Ramapo Catskill which also has no FACTS equipment sent in as many requests as Binghamton.

The decrease in FACTS requests during the summer months that was reported in an earlier section of this study was experienced by most of the individual transmission sites. Similarly, the increase in the fall period represents not only the dramatic increase for Nioga but also increased volume over the summer months for almost all the major senders.

Types of Originating Libraries by Request Transmission Sites

Data on the request transmission sites, given in the preceding section, do not necessarily reflect the type of library which originated the request. In some cases the request transmission site was the originating library; in other cases another library had sent the request to the transmission site to be relayed to the State Library. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the types of libraries that originated the 3,187 FACTS requests. Data presented in Table 5 show that public library systems transmitted 54% of these requests. Is this an indication that the majority of requests received at the State Library during the monitoring period came from public libraries?

In this analysis, the originating library, as recorded on the data sheet, has been classified according to the following categories: graduate and undergraduate schools, undergraduate-only schools, two-year and community colleges, medical schools, public libraries, system headquarters, special and industrial libraries, and "other," which includes New York State agencies, hospitals and secondary schools.

Table 6 shows the different types of libraries that originated the 3,187 FACTS requests, according to their request transmission sites. The 16 transmission sites in Table 5 with the greatest volume of requests are listed individually in Table 6. Of the total of 3,187 FACTS requests analyzed for this report, more than two-thirds (70%) were from schools of all types, with more than half (52%) coming from graduate and undergraduate schools. Public libraries accounted for 22% of all requests and special and industrial libraries and "other" libraries together accounted for 8% of the requests.

The five academic transmission sites--Potsdam, Albany, Clarkson, Cornell and Binghamton--handled requests only from schools, with the exception of six requests from public libraries transmitted by Potsdam (0.6% of their total volume).

Among the nine public library systems that served as transmission sites, there were five with more than 50% of their requests from schools: Nioga (82%), Buffalo and Erie County (69%), Mid-Hudson (60%), Westchester (59%), and Monroe County (57%). In the cases of Buffalo and Erie County and Monroe County, the majority of these requests originated at schools with both graduate and undergraduate facilities. The Westchester Library System serviced only undergraduate institutions, while requests directed through Nioga were mainly from two-year and community colleges. Mid-Hudson transmitted requests from these three categories of institutions in almost equal proportions.

Requests transmitted from the other four public library systems were mainly from public libraries: Ramapo Catskill (95% from public libraries), Suffolk (78%), Mid-York (66%), and Nassau (56%). In Ramapo Catskill, Suffolk and Nassau, these requests originated predominantly at local public libraries. In Mid-York more requests originated at the system headquarters than at local libraries.

The majority of requests received directly by The New York State Library came either from special and industrial libraries (28%) or "other" libraries (34%), which in this case are New York State agencies.

Table 6

TYPES OF ORIGINATING LIBRARIES BY REQUEST TRANSMISSION SITES

	Academic Libraries					Public Libraries			Other Libraries				
Request Transmission Site	Graduate and Undergraduate Schools	Undergraduate Schools	Two-Year and Community Colleges	Medical Schools	All Academic Libraries	Public Libraries	System Headquarters	All Public Libraries	Special and Industrial Libraries	Others	All Others	No Record	Total
SUNY College at Potsdam	95.6% (1,041)	- -	3.9% (42)	- -	99.5% (1,083)	0.3% (3)	0.3% (3)	0.6% (6)	- -	- -	- -	(4)	100.1% (1,093)
Mid-Hudson Libraries	18.7 (134)	18.2% (130)	22.9 (164)	- -	59.8 (428)	22.3 (160)	0.4 (3)	22.7 (163)	17.0% (122)	0.4% (3)	17.4% (125)	(1)	99.9 (717)
Nassau Library System	29.8 (87)	1.7 (5)	12.0 (35)	- -	53.5 (127)	55.8 (163)	0.3 (1)	56.1 (164)	- -	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	(2)	99.9 (294)
Mid-York Library System	14.7 (28)	7.9 (15)	10.5 (20)	- -	33.1 (63)	25.7 (49)	40.8 (78)	66.5 (127)	0.5 (1)	- -	0.5 (1)	(1)	100.1 (192)
Nioga Library System	11.4 (19)	- -	70.1 (117)	- -	81.5 (137)	16.8 (28)	1.8 (3)	18.6 (31)	- -	- -	- -	(5)	100.1 (172)
The New York State Library	26.4 (29)	- -	- -	0.9% (1)	27.3 (30)	10.0 (11)	- -	10.0 (11)	28.2 (31)	34.5 (38)	62.7 (69)	(10)	100.0 (120)
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	68.5 (76)	0.9 (1)	- -	- -	69.4 (77)	- -	21.6 (24)	21.6 (24)	9.0 (10)	- -	9.0 (10)	(3)	100.0 (114)
Suffolk Cooperative Library System	9.5 (10)	- -	5.7 (6)	- -	15.2 (16)	70.5 (74)	7.6 (8)	78.1 (82)	3.8 (4)	2.9 (3)	6.7 (7)	-	100.0 (105)
Monroe County Library System	36.7 (33)	2.2 (2)	- -	17.8 (16)	56.7 (51)	30.0 (27)	- -	30.0 (27)	13.3 (12)	- -	13.3 (12)	-	100.0 (90)
SUNY at Albany	100.0 (61)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (61)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	-	100.0 (61)
Clarkson College of Technology	100.0 (56)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (56)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	-	100.0 (56)
Cornell University	100.0 (55)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (55)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	-	100.0 (55)
Westchester Library System	- -	58.6% (17)	- -	- -	58.6 (17)	34.5% (10)	3.4% (1)	37.9% (11)	3.4% (1)	- -	3.4% (1)	-	99.9 (29)
The New York Public Library Research Libraries	- -	3.6 (1)	3.6% (1)	- -	7.2 (2)	42.9* (26)	- -	42.9 (26)	- -	- -	- -	-	100.1 (28)
Ramapo Catskill Library System	- -	- -	5.3 (1)	- -	5.3 (1)	94.7 (18)	- -	94.7 (18)	- -	- -	- -	-	100.0 (19)
SUNY at Binghamton	100.0 (19)	- -	- -	- -	100.0 (19)	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	-	100.0 (19)
All Others	39.1 (9)	- -	- -	- -	39.1 (9)	8.7 (2)	- -	8.7 (2)	52.2 (12)	- -	52.2 (12)	-	100.0 (23)
All Request Transmission Sites	52.4% (1,657)	5.4% (171)	12.2% (386)	0.5% (17)	70.5% (2,231)	18.1% (571)	3.8% (121)	21.9% (692)	6.1% (193)	1.4% (45)	7.5% (238)	(26)	99.9% (3,187)

---

* These 26 requests actually originated at The New York Public Library Research Libraries.

All but two of the 28 requests transmitted from The New York Public Library Research Libraries also originated at that library.

In summation, academic transmission sites handled requests from schools almost exclusively. Public library systems, on the other hand, transmitted requests from all categories of libraries--with the exception of the Nioga Library System and Ramapo Catskill Library System which had no requests in the "other" category.

Further analysis of this data shows which transmission sites handled the majority of requests from each category of originating library. Of the 2,231 requests which originated at schools, almost one-half were sent from Potsdam and more than two-thirds are accounted for by Potsdam and Mid-Hudson together. Almost two-thirds of the 692 requests which originated at public libraries were transmitted by three transmission sites--Mid-Hudson, Nassau and Mid-York. More than three-fifths of the 193 requests from special and industrial libraries were sent by Mid-Hudson, and more than four-fifths of the 45 requests from "other" libraries were received directly at the State Library.

The third objective of this study, as stated in Chapter I, is "to establish whether, in the various regions of the state, the location of the pilot project's receiving units is appropriately related to the process of referral and the varying amounts of facsimile copy received by libraries in the area." Data presented in this section are relevant to this question since information on originating libraries can be used in evaluating the location of FACTS stations. If a library other than the FACTS station originates most of the requests from an area, perhaps it should be considered as a possible alternative for the location of the FACTS equipment.

Three of the five FACTS stations that are academic libraries--Cornell, SUNY at Albany and SUNY at Binghamton--were reported as being the originating library for all requests they transmitted during the monitoring period. SUNY College at Potsdam transmitted requests from other libraries but the majority of requests from this station originated at Potsdam itself. As noted in an earlier section of this report, Columbia did not transmit any requests during the monitoring period.

Seven of the FACTS stations are public library system headquarters. Three of these--Nassau, Mid-York and Suffolk--had more than 50% of their transmitted requests originate at local public libraries and the system headquarters together. The system headquarters, therefore, seems an appropriate location for these stations. The four other system headquarters had more than 50% of their transmitted requests originate at non-public libraries. Inspection of the raw data shows that requests transmitted from Mid-Hudson originated at many different libraries. However, requests sent from Buffalo and Erie County, Monroe County and Westchester tended to be more concentrated at one originating library or institution. Almost half the requests transmitted from Buffalo and Erie County originated at SUNY at Buffalo (53) and almost half the requests sent from Westchester originated at Marymount College (13). Requests originating at the University of Rochester (27), including the medical school library, accounted for almost one-third of the requests transmitted from Monroe County. When considering this data it should be noted that, while these institutions accounted for a sizable proportion of requests transmitted from each of the three FACTS stations, the actual volume of requests they originated during the monitoring period was not very significant.

Almost all of the requests transmitted by The New York Public Library Research Libraries originated at that library.

Representatives from the 13 FACTS stations other than the State Library were asked whether they thought their library was the best location in the area for the receiving equipment. In considering just the location of the equipment, without taking into account the actual need for the service, ten stations answered yes to the question. They cited reasons such as being centrally located, having the use of the system delivery service to deliver facsimile copy to originating libraries, having teletype equipment, being the strongest library in the area, having the largest library staff and, as a system headquarters, already serving as a clearinghouse for requests from the area. An eleventh station could not answer the question because there had been no demand for the service. The two remaining stations offered alternatives to their location. One, located near the State Library, felt that their requests could be received at the State Library and delivered to them; the other felt an academic library in the area would be a more suitable location.

FACTS REQUESTS SEARCHED IN THE FACTS NETWORK

Status of Requests at the State Library

Table 7 shows the status of the 3,187 FACTS requests after they were searched at the State Library. The proportion of FACTS requests filled at the State Library increased over the study period, ranging by time period from a low of 50% in the first to a high of 67% in the sixth. In the last four time periods, the proportion of requests filled at the Library leveled off at about 62%.

The State Library's ability to fill FACTS requests seems to be related more to the incidence of NIL (not in library) conditions than NOS (not on shelf). In general, NIL requests, which ranged from 19% to 41% of all requests in the individual time periods, were at their highest during the first half of the monitoring when the proportion of filled requests was at its lowest. This situation reversed in the second half of the monitoring. On the other hand, changes in the proportion of NOS

Table 7

STATUS OF FACTS REQUESTS AT THE STATE LIBRARY

Period	Filled at State Library	Not Filled at State Library							Total Requests
		NIL**	NOS**	WNS**	No Such Title	Cancelled	No Record	Total Not Filled	
1/20-3/21	50.0% (159)	32.7% (104)	9.4% (30)	- -	- -	- -	7.9% (25)	50.0% (159)	100.0% (318)*
3/22-4/21	56.2 (196)	28.1 (98)	10.0 (35)	- -	- -	- -	5.7 (20)	43.8 (153)	100.0 (349)
4/22-5/21	59.5 (225)	29.6 (112)	7.4 (28)	0.3% (1)	- -	0.5% (2)	2.6 (10)	40.4 (153)	99.9 (378)
5/22-6/21	52.4 (89)	40.6 (69)	4.1 (7)	- -	1.2% (2)	- -	1.8 (3)	47.7 (81)	100.1 (170)
6/22-7/21	62.1 (128)	28.6 (59)	6.3 (13)	- -	- -	- -	2.9 (6)	37.8 (78)	99.9 (206)
7/22-8/21	67.3 (152)	27.0 (61)	5.3 (12)	- -	- -	- -	0.4 (1)	32.7 (74)	100.0 (226)
8/22-9/21	62.3 (119)	29.8 (57)	5.8 (11)	- -	- -	1.6 (3)	0.5 (1)	37.7 (72)	100.0 (191)
9/22-10/21	63.0 (301)	27.4 (131)	9.2 (44)	- -	- -	- -	0.4 (2)	37.0 (177)	100.0 (478)
10/22-11/21	62.3 (419)	18.9 (127)	16.8 (113)	- -	- -	0.1 (1)	1.9 (13)	37.7 (254)	100.0 (673)
11/22-11/30	62.6 (117)	24.1 (45)	10.2 (19)	- -	- -	- -	3.2 (6)	37.5 (70)	100.1 (187)
All Periods Combined	60.0% (1,905)	27.2% (863)	9.8% (312)	- (1)	0.1% (2)	0.2% (6)	2.7% (87)	40.0% (1,271)	100.0% (3,176)*

---

* The data sheets for 11 additional requests from the first time period do not indicate whether they were filled at the State Library or a FACTS referral station.

NOTE: NIL - Not in library.
NOS - Not on shelf.
WNS - Will not send.

requests did not seem to affect the proportion of requests being filled. The trend for NOS requests tended to follow that of the total volume of requests received--low during the summer months and higher in the spring and fall. Thus, the proportion of FACTS requests filled at the State Library was not adversely affected by the increased volume in FACTS requests (as well as NYSILL requests) experienced during the spring and fall of the year. This is probably due to the fact that the majority of FACTS requests are for articles in periodicals.[12] Since the State Library's policy is to not loan periodicals, but to provide photocopies, increases in the volume of periodical requests does not affect the availability of this material except for problems involved in reshelving.

Of the 1,271 requests that were not filled at the State Library, about three-quarters were NIL and about one-quarter were NOS.

Referrals

Of the 1,271 FACTS requests not filled at the State Library between January 20 and November 30, 1967, 94% (1,192 requests) were referred on to at least one other library in the network. The proportion of unfilled requests that were referred in each time period did not vary significantly from this overall percentage, ranging from a high of 99% in the fourth period to a low of 86% in the tenth period.

As shown in Table 8, three-quarters of the 1,192 requests were referred only once.

The degree of success in filling requests that were referred once, twice, three times and four times beyond the State Library is presented in Table 9.[13] One, two and even three referrals seem to be effective in filling FACTS requests; however, none of the 24 requests that were referred four times were filled.

---

[12] A study made of a sample of 320 FACTS requests indicated that an estimated 95% of all the FACTS requests submitted between January 20 and November 30, 1967 were for articles from periodicals.

[13] In computing this table, the number of requests filled at each stage of the referral process in the FACTS network was compared with all requests that reached each stage, which includes requests that were also referred beyond it. For example, the number of requests filled at the first referral site in the first time period must be compared with the 114 requests referred only once--plus the 21 requests referred twice, the five requests referred three times and the seven requests referred four times--a total of 147 requests (see Table 8).

Table 8

NUMBER OF REFERRALS FOR 1,192 FACTS REQUESTS REFERRED BEYOND THE STATE LIBRARY

Period	One Referral	Two Referrals	Three Referrals	Four Referrals	Total Requests Referred
1/20-3/21	77.6% (114)	14.3%[a] (21)	3.4% (5)	4.8% (7)	100.1% (147)
3/22-4/21	68.3 (99)	23.4 (34)[b]	4.8 (7)	3.4 (5)	99.9 (145)
4/22-5/21	63.9 (94)	21.1 (31)	8.8 (13)	6.1 9	99.9 (147)
5/22-6/21	72.5 (58)	18.8 (15)	6.2 (5)	2.5 (2)	100.0 (80)
6/22-7/21	69.3 (52)	22.7 (17)	6.7 (5)	1.3 (1)	100.0 (75)
7/22-8/21	81.9 (59)	12.5 (9)	5.6 (4)	-	100.0 (72)
8/22-9/21	79.1 (51)	18.8 (12)	1.6 (1)	-	100.1 (64)
9/22-10/21	77.7 (129)	21.1 (35)	1.2 (2)	-	100.0 (166)
10/22-11/21	85.6 (202)	11.9 (28)[c]	2.5 (6)	-	100.0 (236)
11/22-11/30	83.3 (50)	15.0 (9)	1.7 (1)	-	100.0 (60)
All Periods Combined	76.2% (908)	17.7% (211)	4.1% (49)	2.0% (24)	100.0% (1,192)

---

[a] Includes 2 requests filled by the State Library after one referral.

[b] Includes 1 request filled by the State Library after one referral.

[c] Includes 2 requests filled by the State Library after one referral.

Table 9

PERCENTAGE OF REQUESTS FILLED AT EACH STAGE OF REFERRAL

Period	First Referral	Second Referral	Third Referral	Fourth Referral	All Referrals
1/20-3/21	63.3%	54.5%	8.3%	-	56.3%
3/22-4/21	63.4	67.4	41.7	-	61.5
4/22-5/21	57.1	50.9	36.4	-	51.5
5/22-6/21	71.2	50.0	71.4	-	65.8
6/22-7/21	58.7	39.1	-	-	50.5
7/22-8/21	70.8	23.1	-	-	60.7
8/22-9/21	51.6	23.1	100.0	-	47.4
9/22-10/21	55.4	51.4	-	-	54.1
10/22-11/21	65.7	29.4	50.0	-	60.9
11/22-11/30	70.0	50.0	-	-	66.2
All Periods Combined	62.3%	47.9%	31.5%	-	57.3%

Table 10 shows the number of FACTS requests referred to each referral library.[14] During the ten months between January 20 and November 30, 1967, The New York Public Library Research Libraries received the greatest number of referrals--649 (41% of all referrals). The proportion of referrals sent to this library is highest for requests from the first time period (54%), which is understandable since this station and the State Library operated alone for the first three weeks of the FACTS pilot program. For seven of the ten time periods, The New York Public Library Research Libraries received the greatest number of

---

[14] In this particular analysis, one request may be counted as many as four times, as in the case when a request is referred to four different libraries. The 1,192 requests that were referred once, twice, three times or four times accounted for a total of 1,573 referrals.

Table 10

NUMBER OF FACTS REQUESTS RECEIVED AT DIFFERENT REFERRAL

Period	The New York Public Library Research Libraries	Cornell University	Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	Columbia University	Monroe County Library System	The New York Academy of Medicine	Engineering Societies Library	Teachers College	Th Metrop Museu Ar
1/20-3/21	53.8% (107)	26.6% (53)	11.1% (22)	-	5.5% (11)	0.5% (1)	-	-	-
3/22-4/21	42.3 (88)	26.0 (54)	18.7 (39)	1.9% (4)	4.8 (10)	2.9 (6)	-	0.5% (1)	0.5% (1)
4/22-5/21	44.6 (103)	30.7 (71)	18.6 (43)	0.4 (1)	4.8 (11)	0.9 (2)	-	-	-
5/22-6/21	42.3 (47)	35.1 (39)	8.1 (9)	3.6 (4)	2.7 (3)	1.8 (2)	3.6% (4)	0.9 (1)	-
6/22-7/21	41.0 (43)	33.3 (35)	6.7 (7)	7.6 (8)	2.9 (3)	1.0 (1)	1.9 (2)	2.9 (3)	-
7/22-8/21	23.6 (21)	60.7 (54)	2.2 (2)	10.1 (9)	-	-	3.4 (3)	-	-
8/22-9/21	25.6 (20)	43.6 (34)	9.0 (7)	7.7 (6)	-	1.3 (1)	5.1 (4)	-	3.8 (3)
9/22-10/21	32.7 (67)	36.1 (74)	0.5 (1)	12.2 (25)	-	6.3 (13)	5.4 (11)	5.9 (12)	0.5 (1)
10/22-11/21	44.6 (123)	33.3 (92)	7.2 (20)	6.5 (18)	-	2.2 (6)	1.1 (3)	3.3 (9)	0.4 (1)
11/22-11/30	42.3 (30)	22.5 (16)	4.2 (3)	22.5 (16)	-	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	2.8 (2)
All Periods Combined	41.3% (649)	33.2% (522)	9.7% (153)	5.8% (91)	2.4% (38)	2.1% (33)	1.8% (28)	1.7% (27)	0.5% (8)

---

* New York University was not added to the NYSILL pilot program until September 21, 1967. These two requests, received in the 6/22-7/21

Table 10

UMBER OF FACTS REQUESTS RECEIVED AT DIFFERENT REFERRAL LIBRARIES

nroe County rary System	The New York Academy of Medicine	Engineering Societies Library	Teachers College	The Metropolitan Museum of Art	Brooklyn Public Library	The New York State Library	Union Theological Seminary	New York University	No Name for Referral Site	Total
5.5% (11)	0.5% (1)	-	-	-	-	1.0% (2)	-	-	1.5% (3)	100.0% (199)
4.8 (10)	2.9 (6)	-	0.5% (1)	0.5% (1)	1.0% (2)	0.5 (1)	0.5% (1)	-	0.5% (1)	100.1 (208)
4.8 (11)	0.9 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0 (231)
2.7 (3)	1.8 (2)	3.6% (4)	0.9 (1)	-	1.8 (2)	-	-	-	-	99.9 (111)
2.9 (3)	1.0 (1)	1.9 (2)	2.9 (3)	-	1.0 (1)	-	-	1.9%* (2)	-	100.2 (105)
-	-	3.4 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0 (89)
-	1.3 (1)	5.1 (4)	-	3.8 (3)	1.3 (1)	-	2.6 (2)	-	-	100.0 (78)
-	6.3 (13)	5.4 (11)	5.9 (12)	0.5 (1)	-	-	-	0.5 (1)	-	100.1 (205)
-	2.2 (6)	1.1 (3)	3.3 (9)	0.4 (1)	-	0.7 (2)	0.7 (2)	-	-	100.1 (276)
-	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	1.4 (1)	2.8 (2)	1.4 (1)	-	-	-	-	99.7 (71)
2.4% (38)	2.1% (33)	1.8% (28)	1.7% (27)	0.5% (8)	0.4% (7)	0.3% (5)	0.3% (5)	0.2% (3)	0.3% (4)	100.0% (1,573)

mber 21, 1967. These two requests, received in the 6/22-7/21 period,were referred to New York University on October 31.

referrals. For the three periods from 7/22-10/21, it received the second highest number of referrals, while Cornell University received the greatest number.

From January 20 to November 30, 1967, Cornell received 33% of all FACTS referrals. Together, Cornell and The New York Public Library Research Libraries received from 65% to 84% of the referrals for each time period.

The three remaining FACTS referral stations--Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Columbia University and Monroe County Library System--received 10%, 6% and 2% of the referrals, respectively, during the ten-month period. Columbia's low proportion of referrals is partly due to the fact that facsimile transmission equipment was not installed at this library until June, while the other sending stations began operating in February.

Table 10 also shows that referrals were made to The New York Academy of Medicine, Engineering Societies Library, Teachers College, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Brooklyn Public Library, Union Theological Seminary and New York University, all of which are contracting libraries in the NYSILL program. These referrals are included here since they were for FACTS requests that were either previously or subsequently referred to one or more FACTS stations. Except for one request referred to The New York Academy of Medicine, none of the requests shown here was filled. The request filled at The New York Academy of Medicine, as well as two filled at Columbia University before it became a sending station, are included in this report because it was noted on the data sheet that they had been transmitted "via NYPL." In addition, the State Library is shown as a referral site for five requests. These requests originally had been NOS (not on shelf) at the State Library and were referred to another library. When the referral site was unable to fill them, they were searched again at the State Library and filled there.

Table 11 on the next page shows the status of the 1,573 referrals at the various referral sites. Cornell filled 74% of the requests referred to it, The New York Public Library Research Libraries filled 65%, Columbia filled 50%, Buffalo and Erie County filled 24% and Monroe County filled 3%.

In considering the total number of referred requests that were filled at FACTS stations (902 requests), 47% were filled by The New York Public Library Research Libraries, 43% by Cornell, 5% by Columbia and 4% by Buffalo and Erie County.

Table 12 identifies the number of requests sent to each of the FACTS stations that were being referred for the first, second, third and fourth time. Whereas Table 11 indicated that Monroe County Library System filled only one of the 38 requests referred to it, Table 12 shows that half of the referrals sent to Monroe were for requests that already had been referred to three other libraries. On the other hand, the New

Table 11

STATUS OF FACTS REQUESTS AT REFERRAL LIBRARIES*

		Not Filled							
Referral Libraries	Filled	NIL**	NOS**	WNS**	Cancelled	More Information Needed	No Record	Total Not Filled	Total
Brooklyn Public Library	-	100.0%	-	-	-	-	-	100.0%	100.0%
	-	(7)	-	-	-	-	-	(7)	(7)
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	24.2%	64.7	4.6%	-	-	-	6.5%	75.8	100.0
	(37)	(99)	(7)	-	-	-	(10)	(116)	(153)
Columbia University	49.5	14.3	6.6	1.1%	1.1%	-	27.5	50.6	100.1
	(45)	(13)	(6)	(1)	(1)	-	(25)	(46)	(91)
Cornell University	74.1	16.7	2.5	0.8	0.6	0.6%	4.5	25.7	99.8
	(387)	(87)	(13)	(4)	(3)	(3)	(25)	(135)	(522)
Engineering Societies Library	-	71.4	17.9	-	-	-	10.7	100.0	100.0
	-	(20)	(5)	-	-	-	(3)	(28)	(28)
Monroe County Library System	2.6	94.7	-	-	-	-	2.6	97.3	99.9
	(1)	(36)	-	-	-	-	(1)	(37)	(38)
New York University	-	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	100.0	100.0
	-	(3)	-	-	-	-	-	(3)	(3)
Teachers College	-	51.9	18.5	22.2	-	-	7.4	100.0	100.0
	-	(14)	(5)	(6)	-	-	(2)	(27)	(27)
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	-	50.0	-	25.0	-	-	25.0	100.0	100.0
	-	(4)	-	(2)	-	-	(2)	(8)	(8)
The New York Academy of Medicine	3.0	75.8	12.1	-	-	-	9.1	97.0	100.0
	(1)	(25)	(4)	-	-	-	(3)	(32)	(33)
The New York Public Library Research Libraries	65.2	25.9	2.8	3.4%	-	-	2.5	34.6	99.8
	(423)	(168)	(18)	(22)	(2)	-	(16)	(226)	(649)
The New York State Library	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
	(5)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(5)
Union Theological Seminary	-	80.0	-	-	-	-	20.0	100.0	100.0
	-	(4)	-	-	-	-	(1)	(5)	(5)
No Name for Referral Site	75.0	-	25.0	-	-	-	-	25.0	100.0
	(3)	-	(1)	-	-	-	-	(1)	(4)
All Referral Libraries	57.3%	30.5%	3.8%	2.2%	0.4%	1.2%	5.6%	42.7%	100.0%
	(902)	(480)	(59)	(35)	(6)	(3)	(88)	(671)	(1,573)

---

* In this table, the number of requests not filled at the different referral libraries totals 671. However, since some of these requests were then referred to other libraries and filled there, the total number of requests ultimately unfilled during the ten-month monitoring period amounted to only 369.

** Note: NIL - Not in library.
NDS - Not on shelf.
WNS - Will not send.

York Public Library Research Libraries, which filled the greatest number of all referrals filled, received the most first referrals (546).

Table 12

FACTS STATIONS AS STAGES IN THE REFERRAL PROCESS

FACTS Stations	First Referral	Second Referral	Third Referral	Fourth Referral	Total
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	54.2% (83)	35.9% (55)	8.5% (13)	1.3% (2)	99.9% (153)
Columbia University	73.6 (67)	16.5 (15)	9.9 (9)	-	100.0 (91)
Cornell University	76.8 (401)	16.5 (86)	6.3 (33)	0.4 (2)	100.0 (522)
Monroe County Library System	34.2 (13)	2.6 (1)	15.8 (6)	47.4 (18)	100.0 (38)
The New York Public Library Research Libraries	84.1 (546)	14.5 (94)	1.2 (8)	0.2 (1)	100.0 (649)

Number of Requests Filled in Network

Of the 3,187 FACTS requests that entered the FACTS network, a total of 2,818 (88%) was filled. Table 13 combines information from previous tables and shows the number of requests in each of the ten time periods that were filled either at the State Library or at one of the referral sites. The highest proportion of filled requests from any one time period was 95%, in the fourth time period; the lowest was 82%, in the seventh time period. In each time period, 77% or more of all requests received were filled at the State Library and the first referral site together.

Unfilled FACTS Requests

Of the total of 3,187 FACTS requests received at the State Library between January 20 and November 30, 1967, some 369 (12%) were not filled. The reasons for this are shown in Table 14. Requests were cancelled either by the originating library or the State Library, generally because of unusual delays in getting them filled.

Table 13

NUMBER OF REQUESTS FILLED AT EACH STAGE IN FACTS NETWORK AS PERCENT OF ALL FACTS REQUESTS FOR EACH TIME PERIOD

		Number of Requests Filled					
Period	Total Requests	At State Library	At 1st Referral Site	At 2nd Referral Site	At 3rd Referral Site	Not Known Where Filled*	Total Filled
1/20-3/21	329	48.3% (159)	28.3% (93)	5.5% (18)	0.3% (1)	3.3% (11)	85.7% (282)
3/22-4/21	349	56.2 (196)	26.4 (92)	8.9 (31)	1.4 (5)	- -	92.8 (324)
4/22-5/21	378	59.5 (225)	22.2 (84)	7.1 (27)	2.1 (8)	- -	91.0 (344)
5/22-6/21	170	52.4 (89)	33.5 (57)	6.5 (11)	2.9 (5)	- -	95.3 (162)
6/22-7/21	206	62.1 (128)	21.4 (44)	4.4 (9)	- -	- -	87.9 (181)
7/22-8/21	226	67.3 (152)	22.6 (51)	1.3 (3)	- -	- -	91.2 (206)
8/22-9/21	191	62.3 (119)	17.3 (33)	1.6 (3)	0.5 (1)	- -	81.7 (156)
9/22-10/21	478	63.0 (301)	19.2 (92)	4.0 (19)	- -	- -	86.2 (412)
10/22-11/21	673	62.3 (419)	23.0 (155)	1.5 (10)	0.4 (3)	- -	87.2 (587)
11/22-11/30	187	62.6 (117)	22.5 (42)	2.7 (5)	- -	- -	87.7 (164)
All Periods Combined	3,187	59.8% (1,905)	23.3% (743)	4.3% (136)	0.7% (23)	0.3% (11)	88.4% (2,818)

---

* The data sheets for these 11 requests do not indicate whether they were filled at the State Library or a FACTS referral station.

Table 14

REASONS FACTS REQUESTS WERE NOT FILLED

Period	Not Available in Network	Cancelled	Total
1/20-3/21	91.5%	8.5%	100.0%
	(43)	(4)	(47)
3/22-4/21	52.0	48.0	100.0
	(13)	(12)	(25)
4/22-5/21	50.0	50.0	100.0
	(17)	(17)	(34)
5/22-6/21	87.5	12.5	100.0
	(7)	(1)	(8)
6/22-7/21	64.0	36.0	100.0
	(16)	(9)	(25)
7/22-8/21	70.0	30.0	100.0
	(14)	(6)	(20)
8/22-9/21	62.9	37.1	100.0
	(22)	(13)	(35)
9/22-10/21	50.0	50.0	100.0
	(33)	(33)	(66)
10/22-11/21	47.7	52.3	100.0
	(41)	(45)	(86)
11/22-11/30	52.2	47.8	100.0
	(12)	(11)	(23)
All Periods Combined	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%
	(218)	(151)	(369)

RECEIPT OF FILLED FACTS REQUEST BY PATRON

Reception Site for FACTS Requests

The second objective of this study, outlined previously in Chapter I, is "to determine the extent to which the number of facsimile sending and/or receiving devices at each participating library was adequate for the transmission volume experienced." No tabulation was made of the number of filled FACTS requests received at each station during the monitoring period. However, data on the volume of requests transmitted to the State Library from the different transmission sites (shown in Table 5), together with information on where these requests were filled, can be used in answering this question.

All requests sent from transmission sites that are also FACTS stations were filled by facsimile copy received at the same station that transmitted the request. Requests transmitted to the State Library from sites without FACTS receiving equipment were filled by copy received at the following FACTS stations: Nioga's requests at Buffalo and Erie County, Clarkson's requests at Potsdam, Ramapo Catskill's at Mid-Hudson, Brookhaven's at Suffolk and Union's at the State Library.[15]

Using this information on reception sites, and assuming that all FACTS requests from the different transmission sites shown in Table 5 were filled, it is possible to calculate a hypothetical average number of filled requests received daily at each FACTS station for requests from each time period. This calculation (not presented here) shows that the heaviest volume of filled requests transmitted to any station would have been at Potsdam for requests made by Potsdam and Clarkson in the 11/22-11/30 period. Filling 100% of these requests would have meant that Potsdam received an average of 10-1/2 filled requests per day for this period. With 16 hours of available receiving time daily (two receiving devices each operating for eight hours), and an estimated average of one hour to receive each request, the equipment should have easily handled this amount of copy.

For requests in other time periods, the greatest average number of filled requests transmitted daily to any of the receiving stations would have been as follows:

---

[15] No reception site is given on the data sheets for requests transmitted from North Country Library System, Columbia University Medical Library, SUNY at Buffalo or Engineering Societies Library. However, these four transmission sites accounted for a total of only six requests received at the State Library during the monitoring period.

1/20-3/21 -- 5.8 (Potsdam)
3/22-4/21 -- 6.7 (Potsdam)
4/22-5/21 -- 5.0 (Potsdam)
5/22-6/21 -- 2.3 (Mid-Hudson)
6/22-7/21 -- 3.3 (Mid-Hudson)
7/22-8/21 -- 6.0 (Potsdam)
8/22-9/21 -- 3.0 (Mid-Hudson)
9/22-10/21 -- 7.4 (Mid-Hudson)
10/22-11/21 -- 7.9 (Buffalo and Erie County)

Filled requests transmitted to FACTS stations are, of course, not spread out evenly over the time period as the use of averages implies, but are often grouped together so that there are times when the load is considerably higher than the average. However, when queried about whether the number of machines is adequate to handle the volume of copy received,[16] 12 of the 13 FACTS stations other than the State Library said that the number they have is sufficient. One of the 12 stations had experienced some strain on machine use during a period of high volume in the fall months but volume has since decreased. Most of these stations thought that they really need only one receiver, although it is useful to have two for the times when one is not working. The one station that felt that the number of machines they have is not adequate for their volume of filled requests would prefer to have faster machines rather than more machines.

Of the five FACTS stations that also have sending equipment, one with three sending devices reported a few days when the volume of material to be transmitted was so great that they decided to mail photocopies of some of the requested material in order to give faster service. The other sending stations felt that the number of machines they have is adequate at all times for the volume of work they handle.

Means of Delivery to Originating Libraries

Each FACTS station, in cooperation with the local reference and research library resources agency, is required to provide a means of delivering received facsimile copy to libraries in the immediate area. Six of the seven FACTS stations that are public library system headquarters--Buffalo and Erie County, Mid-York, Monroe County, Nassau, Suffolk and Westchester--use the system delivery service to transport the facsimile copy when the originating library is a member library of the system. In addition, Suffolk uses the system delivery for all other libraries. Non-public libraries served by the five other stations receive their copy by first class mail, United Parcel, or by picking it up at the system headquarters. Mid-Hudson, the seventh system headquarters that is also a FACTS station, uses first class mail for delivering all facsimile copy received.

---

[16] SUNY at Binghamton has one receiver; all other FACTS stations had at least two receivers during the monitoring period.

Most facsimile copy received at three of the five FACTS stations that are academic libraries--Cornell, SUNY at Albany and SUNY at Binghamton--is for the institution itself. In the few instances when the copy has been for another library in the area, it was either mailed or picked up. Potsdam receives a greater number of transmitted requests for other libraries. This station uses a truck delivery system to deliver facsimile copy to Clarkson College, St. Lawrence University and the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Canton; copy for other libraries is mailed. Columbia has received only two filled requests since June, when their facsimile equipment was installed. However, if demand for the service increased, they would probably use pages to deliver the copy.

Pages are used to deliver facsimile copy received at The New York Public Library Research Libraries to libraries in New York City and Westchester County.

Facsimile copy received at the State Library is delivered to libraries by the delivery service of the local reference and research library resources agency.

A FACTS postcard-questionnaire, attached to all facsimile copy received from April to the end of the monitoring period, was delivered with the transmitted material to the originating library. One of the questions on the postcard asked the librarian at the originating library to indicate whether the material had been sent to the library by mail, by system delivery or messenger, or by other means. As noted earlier, responses from 772 returned postcards were tabulated for this report. The tally of the postcard responses to this question is presented in Table 15, which shows that about 40% of the requests were received by facsimile transmission. Presumably these responses represent requests from originating libraries that are also FACTS receiving stations. Another 40% of the requests were received at the originating library by mail. The balance of the requests were delivered by system delivery or messenger (16%) or by other means (4%).

Time Lapse Between Patron Request and Receipt of FACTS Material

In order to calculate the time lapse between the patron's request and his receipt of FACTS material, either the data sheets from originating libraries completed during the January 20 to March 21, 1967 period or the postcard-questionnaires which were used thereafter were matched by request number with their corresponding data sheets at the State Library. The time lapse was computed by counting the weekdays, Monday through Friday, minus any holidays, between the date and time the patron submitted his request

Table 15

MEANS BY WHICH ORIGINATING LIBRARIES RECEIVED FILLED FACTS REQUESTS

Period	Facsimile Transmission	Mail	System Delivery or Messenger	Other	No Answer	Total
3/22-4/21	9.1%	81.8%	9.1%	-	-	100.0%
	(2)	(18)	(2)		(2)	(24)
4/22-5/21	30.5	35.6	23.2	10.7	-	100.0
	(54)	(63)	(41)	(19)	(12)	(189)
5/22-6/21	27.4	58.1	11.3	3.2	-	100.0
	(17)	(36)	(7)	(2)	(7)	(69)
6/22-7/21	47.5	24.6	26.2	1.6	-	99.9
	(29)	(15)	(16)	(1)	(4)	(65)
7/22-8/21	75.5	10.2	12.2	2.0	-	99.9
	(37)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(4)	(53)
8/22-9/21	8.7	82.6	8.7	-	-	100.0
	(4)	(38)	(4)	-	(6)	(52)
9/22-10/21	48.5	40.8	10.8	-	-	100.1
	(63)	(53)	(14)	-	(4)	(134)
10/22-11/21	43.6	35.3	19.5	1.5	-	99.9
	(58)	(47)	(26)	(2)	(12)	(145)
11/22-11/30	67.5	27.5	5.0	-	-	100.0
	(27)	(11)	(2)	-	(1)	(41)
All Periods Combined	40.4%	39.7%	16.4%	3.5%		100.0%
	(291)	(286)	(118)	(25)	(52)	(772)

at the originating library and the date and time he received facsimile copy in response to his request.[17]

Of the 772 requests represented in the postcard returns, 745 had sufficient information on both the data sheet and the postcard to compute elapsed times. Together with 109 data sheets from originating libraries that were matched with the State Library's data sheets for the first time period, there was a total of 854 requests for the entire monitoring period that had data on elapsed time. These 854 requests represent 30% of the 2,818 requests that were filled in the ten-month monitoring period.

Table 16 shows the average, median and range for the number of working days elapsed between patrons' requests and their receipt of FACTS material for each of the ten time periods.

Data in this table are presented with the following reservations:

1. Data from the second period should be discounted. Elapsed times for this period will tend to be longer than actually experienced because postcards were not distributed until the beginning of the third time period and, therefore, these elapsed times represent requests received during the second period but not filled until the third period.

2. The elapsed times for the first period include data for a few requests that were filled by mail as well as for those filled by facsimile copy.

---

[17] The time of day was rounded to the nearest hour. If there was no time of day recorded, it was arbitrarily considered to be 2 p.m.; if just "a.m." was indicated, it was considered to be 10 a.m.; and if just "p.m." was indicated, it was considered to be 3 p.m.

Table 16

TIME LAPSE BETWEEN PATRON REQUEST AND RECEIPT OF MATERIAL

	Requests with Data on Time		Number of Working Days Elapsed		
Period	Number	Percent of Those Filled	Average	Median	Range
1/20-3/21	109	38.7%	5.7	4.8	0.2-30.1
3/22-4/21	21	6.5	21.9	22.2	6.7-52.2
4/22-5/21	173	50.3	9.3	6.0	1.0-54.1
5/22-6/21	64	39.5	5.9	4.1	1.0-33.0
6/22-7/21	63	34.8	4.3	3.1	0.2-27.1
7/22-8/21	52	25.2	2.3	2.0	0.2-13.0
8/22-9/21	52	33.3	5.4	4.9	1.7-31.8
9/22-10/21	134	32.5	7.6	5.8	2.1-25.8
10/22-11/21	145	24.7	6.5	5.8	1.9-22.1
11/22-11/30	41	25.0	6.2	6.0	3.1-23.0

Of the 854 requests with data on elapsed time, seven had been filled within 24 hours. If the information from the 854 requests (or from a smaller sample of 833 requests, excluding the 21 from the second time period) is representative of all requests filled during the monitoring period, about 25 requests were filled within 24 hours during the ten months from January 20 to November 30, 1967.

In general, the change in elapsed time from one period to another seems to follow a pattern similar to that for the average daily number of FACTS requests received at the State Library--an increase in the spring, a decrease during the summer months, and then an increase again in the fall. The one exception to this pattern occurred in the 8/22-9/21 period. Here the volume of FACTS requests was still at a very low level (an average of nine requests per day), but the median time lapse between patron request and receipt of material had increased to five days, which is more than double that of the preceding period. There is good reason to believe that this increase in elapsed time coincided with disruptions in the operations of the program at the State Library, and possibly other FACTS stations, caused by a significant turnover of clerical personnel at the end of the summer.

PATRON REACTION TO FACTS

Patron Reaction to Speed of Service

The FACTS postcard-questionnaire asked patrons if the service (of having requests filled by facsimile transmission) would be equally useful if it took two or three days longer to receive the material. When the questionnaire was designed, it was thought that in general there would only be a lapse of two or three days between the time the patron made his request and the time he received the material. The purpose of this particular question was to determine whether patrons really needed their material within a day or two or could instead wait a few more days to receive it, perhaps through the conventional interlibrary loan means of mailed photocopy. However, as shown in the preceding section on elapsed time, FACTS requests were not often filled within two or three days; in some cases it took as many as 20 days or more.

The postcards with answers to this question indicate that 70% of the requests would have been equally useful if it had taken two or three days longer to receive the material and 30% would not have been as useful. This response is rather surprising in view of the requirement that FACTS requests are to be of a serious, urgent nature necessitating rapid handling. The response could be interpreted to mean that there is no great demand for such fast service. However, viewed in the context of patrons' experience with the program, the response perhaps should be considered more an expression of their expectations of the service. As the program operated, it must have become well known that FACTS was not often filling requests within 24, or even 48, hours and demands on the service were probably adjusted accordingly. If a patron was told to expect to have his request filled within five or six days, and it was, he was probably satisfied. And, in view of a five or six day wait, another two or three days may not have seemed unfavorable. Certainly, the question on the postcard lost much of its original impact. Instead of asking, in effect, if the patron could have used the material if it had taken twice as long to receive it, in most cases it asked if the material would have been useful if it had taken only half again as long.

Details from the tabulation of this question are shown in Table 17. It should be noted that this table gives the frequency distribution of elapsed times for 745 requests received at the State Library between March 22 and November 30, 1967.

Patrons' Suggestions for Improvement in Service

An open-ended question on the postcard sought patrons' suggestions for improvement in service. Table 18 presents the tabulation of this question. In the 772 returned postcards, 58% had no answer to this question, which might be interpreted to mean that these patrons did not have any suggestions for improvement. Of those responding to

<ins>Table 17</ins>

PATRONS' RESPONSES TO QUESTION "WOULD THIS SERVICE BE EQUALLY USEFUL IF IT TOOK 2 OR 3 DAYS LONGER TO RECEIVE THE MATERIAL?" BY NUMBER OF DAYS BETWEEN PATRON REQUEST AND RECEIPT OF MATERIAL

		Less Than 1 Day	1-2 Days	2-3 Days	3-4 Days	4-5 Days	5-10 Days	10-15 Days	15-20 Days	20+ Days	No Data on Elapsed Time	Total
3/22-4/21	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	1	7	-	14
	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	-	6
	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	4
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	3	12	3	24
4/22-5/21	Yes	-	1	2	7	13	49	8	7	8	10	105
	No	-	1	-	13	13	25	5	-	6	3	66
	NA	-	-	-	-	1	4	3	1	6	3	18
	Total	-	2	2	20	27	78	16	8	20	16	189
5/22-6/21	Yes	1	-	6	5	7	9	-	2	2	1	33
	No	-	1	3	4	1	5	-	-	1	3	18
	NA	-	-	4	4	4	5	-	-	-	1	18
	Total	1	1	13	13	12	19	-	2	3	5	69
6/22-7/21	Yes	1	4	20	8	5	7	3	1	-	-	49
	No	-	-	3	1	3	3	-	-	1	2	13
	NA	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
	Total	1	5	24	9	8	11	3	1	1	2	65
7/22-8/21	Yes	-	2	13	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	21
	No	3	20	3	1	1	2	1	-	-	1	32
	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	3	22	16	3	2	4	2	-	-	1	53
8/22-9/21	Yes	-	-	3	13	15	13	-	-	1	-	45
	No	-	2	1	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	7
	NA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	2	4	13	15	17	-	-	1	-	52
9/22-10/21	Yes	-	-	6	20	16	50	14	3	5	-	114
	No	-	-	-	3	5	6	1	-	4	-	19
	NA	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Total	-	-	6	23	21	57	15	3	9	-	134
10/22-11/21	Yes	-	-	6	11	13	55	7	4	-	-	96
	No	-	2	4	3	14	13	5	1	1	-	43
	NA	-	-	1	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	6
	Total	-	2	11	14	27	71	14	5	1	-	145
11/22-11/30	Yes	-	-	-	8	-	14	1	-	1	-	24
	No	-	-	-	2	2	12	-	-	-	-	16
	NA	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Total	-	-	-	10	2	27	1	-	1	-	41
All Periods Combined	Yes	2	7	56	74	70	203	36	18	24	11	501
	No	3	26	14	27	39	70	12	3	17	9	220
	NA	-	1	6	4	5	15	5	1	7	7	51
	Total	5	34	76	105	114	288	53	22	48	27	772

Table 18

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICE

Period	Better Copy	Faster Service	Admirable Service	More Than 12 Pages	Complete Article	Status Report	Other*	"No Suggestions"	No Answer	Number of Postcards
3/22-4/21	20.8% (5)	50.0% (12)	- -	- -	- -	4.2% (1)	- -	- -	37.5% (9)	24
4/22-5/21	22.2 (42)	19.0 (36)	3.2% (6)	1.1% (2)	1.6% (3)	1.6 (3)	3.2% (6)	2.6% (5)	55.0 (104)	189
5/22-6/21	17.4 (12)	5.8 (4)	8.7 (6)	- -	1.4 (1)	- -	4.3 (3)	8.7 (6)	58.0 (40)	69
6/22-7/21	21.5 (14)	4.6 (3)	3.1 (2)	- -	- -	- -	3.1 (2)	4.6 (3)	63.1 (41)	65
7/22-8/21	11.3 (6)	- -	5.7 (3)	- -	- -	- -	7.5 (4)	9.4 (5)	67.9 (36)	53
8/22-9/21	28.8 (15)	1.9 (1)	3.8 (2)	- -	9.6 (5)	- -	- -	3.8 (2)	51.9 (27)	52
9/22-10/21	23.1 (31)	3.7 (5)	3.0 (4)	- -	- -	- -	3.0 (4)	8.2 (11)	59.7 (80)	134
10/22-11/21	17.9 (26)	3.4 (5)	7.6 (11)	- -	- -	- -	4.1 (6)	9.0 (13)	58.6 (85)	145
11/22-11/30	7.3 (3)	2.4 (1)	4.9 (2)	26.8 (11)	- -	- -	2.4 (1)	- -	61.0 (25)	41
All Periods Combined	19.9% (154)	8.7% (67)	4.7% (36)	1.7% (13)	1.2% (9)	0.5% (4)	3.4% (26)	5.8% (45)	57.9% (447)	772

---

* The 26 suggestions in the "Other" category are listed on the following page.

NOTE: The number of responses in the different categories for seven of the nine time periods add to a total in excess of the number of postcard-questionnaires returned due to multiple responses.

Twenty-Six "Other" Suggestions:

"Would rather have original to keep in files" (1)

"More connections to other libraries in U.S., Canada, and United Kingdom" (1)

"Prefer copy of title page of periodical, as well (to cover problems of edition and copyright)" (2)

"Service is improved since last used" (1)

"Paper fades quickly, make facsimile more permanent" (2)

"Very clear, easy to read" (1)

"Copy better than before" (1)

"Need a means for communicating pages listed in Roman numerals" (1)

"Work out a system where you can get reproductions of pictures in books and magazines if they have all the proper information (paging, date, magazine) without author and title of article" (1)

"Service should be made known to more people" (1)

"When the requesting library knows a photocopy is available from one of the three area libraries or eight subject libraries, that information should be submitted with the request" (1)

"Add British libraries and British and South African government sources to the facsimile hook-up" (2)

"Inconvenient to have to request facsimile service through the bookmobile which comes every two weeks" (4)

"There is a need for direct delivery service from the FACTS reception site" (1)

"Translate foreign articles" (2)

"Not have libraries wait until they have many requests before they send requests" (1)

"Send information that is necessary for footnote" (2)

"Students do not have a full knowledge of what is needed on their part to expedite faster service" (1) the question, recipients of 6% of the requests wrote no, they did not have any suggestions. One-fifth of the returned postcards mentioned the need for better copy. This was cited in every time period, although less frequently in the last time span monitored. The second most frequent suggestion was the need for faster service (on 9% of the returns). Other comments were that more than 12 pages of copy should be provided; that the material received was incomplete--either pages missing or lines cut off; and that a status report is needed informing the patron of the expected delay so that he can consider trying to get the material elsewhere.

Thirty-six (5%) of the postcards reported that FACTS is an admirable service. The proportion of responses in this category does not vary significantly from one time period to the next.

Chapter III

COSTS OF THE FACTS PROGRAM

The New York State Library extended participation grants to the 13 contracting FACTS libraries to cover the costs of clerical help and copying machine rentals incurred in behalf of the FACTS pilot program. Two separate grants were made, one for the period from February 1 to July 31, 1967, and a second for the period from August 1, 1967 to March 31, 1968. The amount of each institution's grant was determined by the number of facsimile sending and receiving machines installed at each station, at the rate of $1,000 per machine. The total of both participation grants for each of the FACTS network libraries is shown in Table 19.

Nine of the 13 contracting FACTS stations reported that their participation grants were adequate to cover costs. Of these nine stations, one received a total of $3,000 in grants, six stations received $4,000 each, one received $8,000 and one received $12,000. An accounting of the costs attributable to FACTS at the station receiving $12,000 in grants, which is the library that filled the greatest number of referred requests during the monitoring period, shows that about half the amount of the two grants had been spent for professional and clerical salaries and the copying machine rental during the period from January 20, 1967 to January 31, 1968. A tenth station (which received grants totaling $8,000) reported being fairly well satisfied although having some reservations without knowing the actual amount of time the staff was spending on the FACTS program. Another station said that most of the program's costs are being borne by the local 3R's group so that it is difficult to assess the validity of the state's participation grants of $4,000. Only two institutions reported that their grants were not sufficient to cover costs incurred by the program, due to the amount of staff time or supervisory time that must be devoted to it. One of these libraries received a total of $4,000 for the 13-month period covered by the participation grants and the other received $12,000. The former institution was one of the heaviest user stations in the network, while the latter was one of the FACTS network's principal referral sites, so that its participation grants were supplemented by the State Library's unit referral fees.

Because of the substantial disparities in the roles actually played in the FACTS program by the 13 participating institutions (other than the State Library), it would appear that some of the grants were somewhat generous while others left little margin between the grant total and the costs incurred by some of the libraries, especially those that allocated significant amounts of high-level supervisory time to the FACTS project.

The estimated operating costs that can be associated with the FACTS program in the interval from January 20 to November 30, 1967 are

Table 19

PARTICIPATION GRANTS TO FACTS STATIONS*

Institutions	Number of Machines 1/20/67-11/30/67	Participation Grants 2/1/67-7/31/67	8/1/67-3/31/68	Total
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	4	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 8,000
Columbia University	5	2,000	2,000	4,000
Cornell University	6	6,000	6,000	12,000
Mid-Hudson Libraries	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
Mid-York Library System	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
Monroe County Library System	4	4,000	4,000	8,000
Nassau Library System	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
Suffolk Cooperative Library System	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
SUNY at Albany	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
SUNY at Binghamton	1	1,000	2,000	3,000
SUNY College at Potsdam	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
The New York Public Library Research Libraries	6	6,000	6,000	12,000
Westchester Library System	2	2,000	2,000	4,000
Total	40	$37,000	$38,000	$75,000

---

* Data presented in this table show that in some instances The New York State Library, in fact, did not pay institutions at the stated rate of $1,000 per machine.

presented in Table 20. This total cost of $174,986.00, which does not include labor costs at the State Library, provided for the filling of 2,818 FACTS requests. This represents an average expenditure per filled request of $62.10. Approximately 63% of this average unit cost can be attributed to equipment contracts and teletype line and rental expenses, 32% covered the participation grants and 5% was for the unit referral fees and other miscellaneous charges.

Table 20

ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE FACTS PROGRAM*
January 20-November 30, 1967

Item	Amount
Equipment Costs:	
Stewart-Warner Contract #1 (2/1/67-8/31/67)	$ 22,972
Stewart-Warner Contract #2 (2/1/67-8/31/67)	17,913
Stewart-Warner Contract #3 (9/1/67-3/31/68) prorated for 9/1/67-11/30/67 period (42.7%)	17,786
Alden Contract #1 (5/1/67-7/31/67)	11,988
Alden Contract #2 (8/1/67-3/31/68) prorated for 8/1/67-11/30/67 period (50.0%)	16,584
Line and Rental Costs for Teletype Equipment	23,512
Participation Grants:	
Participation grants to FACTS stations (2/1-7/31)	37,000
Participation grants to FACTS stations (8/1/67-3/31/68) prorated for 8/1/67-11/30/67 period (50.0%)	19,000
Unit Referral Fees:	
202 referrals to area centers @ $1.00	202
1,374 referrals to subject centers @ $2.50	3,435
902 referrals filled @ $2.00	1,804
Miscellaneous Installation Charges	2,790
Total	$174,986

---

* Excludes labor costs at the State Library.

Chapter IV

EVALUATION OF THE FACTS NETWORK

The analyses presented in Chapters II and III cover the operations of the facsimile transmission network from its inception on January 20, 1967 until the cutoff date for this report on November 30, 1967. The most essential findings for that ten-month period can be summarized as follows:

F1. Between January 20 and November 30, 1967, a total of 3,187 FACTS requests were received at The New York State Library, an average of about 15 requests per working day.

F2. About 50% of these requests were from students, 30% from faculty members and 20% from "other" patrons.

F3. Postcard returns indicated that about 50% of the filled requests were for use in academic course work, 37% for independent research, 16% for business or professional activities and 4% for other purposes.

F4. Only 51% of the requests were coded so as to identify the subject material. Judging from available data, the most frequently requested titles were in the subjects of social sciences, science and mathematics, and psychology.

F5. Thirteen of the 14 FACTS stations operating as of November 30, 1967 together accounted for the transmission of more than 90% of the 3,187 requests. According to the State Library's records, the fourteenth station, at Columbia University, did not transmit any of the requests received during the monitoring period.

F6. Somewhat more than half of all requests were transmitted to the State Library from just two transmission sites--SUNY College at Potsdam and Mid-Hudson Libraries.

F7. More than two-thirds of requests from all transmission sites originated at schools, with about half coming from graduate and undergraduate schools. In addition, public libraries accounted for 22% of the requests and all other libraries accounted for 8%.

F8. The academic transmission sites handled requests from schools almost exclusively. On the other hand, public library systems that served as transmissions sites tended to handle requests from all different types of originating libraries.

F9. Ten of the 13 FACTS stations other than the State Library thought that their location is the best in the area for the receiving equipment. In the absence of demand for the service, an eleventh station could not make a judgment about the most appropriate location. The two remaining stations offered alternatives to their location. One, located near the State Library, felt that their requests could be received at the State Library and delivered to them; the other thought an academic library in the area would be a more suitable location.

F10. About 60% of the requests received during the ten-month period were filled at the State Library.

F11. Ninety-four percent of the requests that could not be filled at the State Library were referred on to at least one other library in the network. Three-quarters of the referred requests were referred only once.

F12. Requests were filled after one, two and three referrals; however, none of the 24 requests that had been referred four times were filled.

F13. During the ten months between January 20 and November 30, 1967, The New York Public Library Research Libraries received the greatest number of referrals (41%) and Cornell University received the second greatest number (33%). The three remaining FACTS sending stations--Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, Columbia University and Monroe County Library System--received 10%, 6% and 2% of the referrals, respectively.

F14. Cornell University filled 74% of the requests referred to it, The New York Public Library Research Libraries filled 65%, Columbia University filled 50%, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library filled 24% and Monroe County Library System filled 3%. (Half of the referrals sent to Monroe were for requests that had already been referred to three other libraries.)

F15. Of the total number of referred requests that were filled at FACTS stations (902 requests, or 76% of all referred requests), The New York Public Library Research Libraries filled 47%, Cornell filled 43%, Columbia filled 5% and Buffalo-Erie filled 4%.

F16. Of the 3,187 requests that entered the FACTS network, a total of 2,818 (88%) was filled. In each time period, 77% or more of all requests received were filled at the State Library and the first referral site together. Of all requests filled, the State Library and the first referral site together filled 94%.

2

F17. Three libraries--The New York State library, The New York Public Library Research Libraries and Cornell University --filled 97% of the 2,818 requests filled in the ten months from January 20 to November 30, 1967.

F18. The 369 FACTS requests not filled were either not available in the network (59%) or were cancelled (41%).

F19. Twelve of the 13 FACTS stations other than the State Library reported that the number of machines they have was sufficient to handle the volume of copy received. Only one station felt that the number of machines they have was not adequate. Of the five FACTS referral stations that have sending equipment as well as receiving equipment, one that has three sending devices reported experiencing a few days of heavy volume when it was decided they would be giving faster service if they mailed out photocopies. The other sending stations felt that the number of machines they have was adequate at all times for the volume of work they handled.

F20. The 772 postcard returns show that 40% of the filled FACTS requests were received at the originating library by means of facsimile transmission, another 40% were received by mail, 16% by system delivery or messenger and 4% by other means.

F21. The median elapsed time between patron request and receipt of material was about six working days for the three time periods in the fall. In general, the change in elapsed time from one period to another seems to follow a pattern similar to that for the average daily number of FACTS requests received at the State Library--an increase in the spring, a decrease during the summer months, and then an increase again in the fall.

F22. Recipients of 70% of the requests represented in the postcard returns said that the service would have been equally useful if it had taken two or three days longer to receive the material and recipients of the other 30% answered no, it would not have been equally useful.

F23. The most frequently cited suggestion on the postcards for improved service was for better copy (on 20% of the postcards); the second most frequently given suggestion was for faster service (9%).

F24. Considering equipment contracts, teletype line and rental costs, participation grants and unit referral fees, but not including labor costs at the State Library, it cost about $62 to fill each of the 2,818 FACTS requests filled between January 20 and November 30, 1967.

F25. Nine of the 13 contracting FACTS stations reported that their participation grants were adequate to cover costs of clerical help and copying machine rentals. Two stations were not quite sure and two--one both a sending and receiving station and the other only a receiving station--thought that the grants did not cover costs incurred by the program.

The fundamental question in the evaluation of the FACTS network is whether or not the knowledge and experience gained during the pilot project justify its continuation, either in its present format or with certain modifications. Our interpretation of the above findings, along with other investigations into the program, has led us to the following six conclusions:

C1. The poor quality of facsimile copy received has limited the use of the service. Undoubtedly, the greatest cause for dissatisfaction with FACTS is the amount of unusable copy that has been transmitted. The most frequent suggestion for improvement of service, mentioned on 20% of the postcards, is the need for better copy. In addition, interviews with representatives of FACTS stations always produced comments about the high incidence of illegible copy being received. The referral station filling the most requests during the monitoring period estimates that about one-quarter of the requests it filled ultimately had to be re-filled with mailed photocopy because the facsimile copy was found to be unsatisfactory for the patron's use. The technical evaluation of the facsimile transmission equipment produced data on machine use from November 10 to December 8, 1967 that shows that almost as much time was spent using the equipment for repeat transmissions as for original transmissions (9% of available time for all transmissions compared to 5% of available time for original transmissions.)

Not only has the poor copy limited use among patrons who have had actual experience with the FACTS service, it has also restricted use from potential patrons because some FACTS stations are hesitant to publicize the program. Two stations noted they had purposely underplayed the service because of its unsatisfactory results, both in terms of quality of copy and speed in filling requests. Three others have given FACTS very little publicity and a fourth station didn't know what publicity, if any, had been given to the program.

C2. The operation of the FACTS pilot program has not demonstrated that there is potential for sufficient volume of facsimile requests in the foreseeable future to reduce costs to within reasonable limits. If there had been 10,000 FACTS requests instead of 3,187 during the ten-month monitoring period and they had been handled in the same way so that all expenses except the unit referral fees remained the same, the cost per filled request would have been about $20. Without judging whether $20 approaches a reasonable cost for such a service, it is clearly questionable whether the 12,000 "urgent" requests of 12 pages or less needed annually to reduce the cost of a filled request to even $20 would be forthcoming.

As demonstrated during the monitoring period (when over 90% of the requests were transmitted from 13 of the 14 operating FACTS stations), very few requests can be expected to be transmitted from sources other than FACTS stations. The total number of both FACTS and NYSILL requests transmitted from these 14 stations during the eight months from March 22 to November 21, 1967 was about 26,000. Pro-rated for a year, this volume would amount to approximately 39,000 requests. There is little evidence to believe that as many as one-quarter of these interlibrary loan requests would meet the requirements for FACTS requests--that is, requests not longer than 12 pages and of a serious and urgent nature.

C3. Nor has the pilot program demonstrated a high volume of demand for extraordinarily fast interlibrary loan service (such as 24 or 48 hours) which might justify an extensive and costly facsimile network. Although not specifically asked, representatives from six FACTS stations noted that requests they handle seldom, if ever, call for 24-hour servicing. Postcard returns indicated that an estimated 70% of the requests filled would have been equally useful to the patron if they had taken two or three days longer to reach them. Thus, a more conventional interlibrary loan network providing service within two weeks might be an acceptable alternative to the FACTS network for filling most requests.

C4. In an case, it is unlikely that the program as presently staffed, equipped and operated could handle the at least tripled volume, which is necessary to significantly reduce costs, without incurring additional delays in service. There is some evidence to suggest that the greater number of requests received during the spring and fall of the year may have contributed to longer time lapses between patron request and receipt of material during those periods. Also of significance is the fact that the station filling almost one-half of the referred requests during the monitoring period experienced a few days when the number of machines was inadequate for the volume of requests to be filled, and mailed photocopy was resorted to in order to give faster service. The data collected and studied for the monitoring period does not, therefore, support the notion that the FACTS network could reduce elapsed times when handling triple the current volume of requests.

C5. In view of the alternative of special delivery or first-class mailed photocopy which is comparatively inexpensive, it seems unwise to expend large sums of money in order to transmit a request at top speed from a filling site to a FACTS receiving station when other stages of the FACTS network are not operating with nearly the same degree of efficiency. The median elapsed time between patron request and receipt of material in the last three time periods was about 6 days. Since 68% of all filled requests were filled at the State Library and 94% of all filled requests were filled at the State Library and the first referral site together, it seems likely that many of the filled requests were spending as much as two or three days at the State Library and possibly also at a referral site(s). Furthermore, at least 50% of filled requests had to be delivered in some manner to the originating libraries after being received at the nearest FACTS station. Postcard returns indicated that most of these deliveries from the FACTS stations to the originating libraries were made by mail. For example, the station that transmitted the second greatest number of requests during the monitoring period (over one-fifth of the total) originated only 3 of these requests and mailed all others that were filled to the originating libraries it served.

Unfortunately, the speed of special delivery mail has not been tested. However, it would seem that even if it took two or three days on the average for this means of delivery, it would not be out of line with the performance of the rest of the network. In addition to being cheaper, mail is often more flexible than facsimile transmission, offering the advantage of delivering photocopied material from the filling center directly to the originating library or even perhaps to the patron himself.

C6. There is some reason to believe that the operations of the FACTS network have served in part as a substitute to adequate local library collections. Since almost one-quarter of the 3,187 FACTS requests submitted during the ten-month monitoring period originated at one library, it is apparent that a considerable part of the network's operations has been devoted to meeting the research needs of one institution. While this particular library is growing rapidly, it has evidently had difficulty keeping pace with the increased demands accompanying the transition of its parent institution from a teachers' college to a liberal arts college. Other methods of meeting the needs of this research community should be considered as an alternative to costly facsimile transmission.

On the basis of these conclusions, we recommend the following:

R1. The New York State Library should not continue the existing facsimile transmission network beyond its current termination date of March 31, 1968. In the first place, the performance of the facsimile transmission equipment employed does not justify the continuation of the network, not even on a revised or very limited basis. Secondly, the operation of the FACTS pilot program has not proven that facsimile transmissions of library materials offers a decided advantage over less costly alternative ways of handling urgent interlibrary loan transactions.

R2. The State Library should continue to give special attention to requests of a serious and urgent nature but within the context of its NYSILL program. Such request should be handled on a priority basis at the transmission sites, the State Library and the NYSILL referral libraries. If volume warrants, a separate teletype at the State Library should be designated for urgent requests only. Otherwise, they should be submitted at the specified times of day for regular interlibrary loan requests, although distinctly set off from those requiring routine treatment. Special staff at the State Library should be specifically assigned to handle urgent requests. Those requests not filled at the State Library should be referred on to libraries in the NYSILL program on the basis of a bibliographic search performed by the State Library staff. When a request is filled at either the State Library or a referral library, it should be mailed special delivery directly to the originating library.[18]

---

[18] At some point, the State Library might wish to experiment by sending filled, urgent NYSILL requests directly to the requesting patron by special delivery mail.

> Requests to be handled in this manner should be so designated by the patron at the originating library. A nominal fee set by the State Library should be collected from the patron by the originating library when an urgent request is submitted. This fee would serve to gauge the importance the patron attaches to having his request receive priority treatment. Thus, the recommended program would provide a means for handling all urgent requests (not just those within a 12-page facsimile limitation) and would at the same time maintain an ongoing surveillance of the actual need for such a service.

Although we do not believe that the FACTS network should be continued at the present time, it should be emphasized that the results of this experiment have not proven that a facsimile transmission network will never be feasible or desirable in the state. Since the operations of the network over the past year have provided certain guidelines for future projects of this kind, the following additional recommendations therefore seem appropriate:

R3. The State Library should not consider the use of facsimile transmission equipment until there are machines in production that will transmit directly from library materials. The present procedure of having to photocopy material before it is transmitted results in poor copy, extra delays and additional expense.

R4. Before setting up another FACTS network, the State Library should calculate the volume of requests that would have to be handled, knowing the cost of all the equipment to be employed, in order to produce a reasonable cost per filled request and should decide whether this volume is feasible.

R5. The State Library should undertake a study to determine the identity of the potential users of facsimile service before a new FACTS network is instituted. Such a determination could be based on the results obtained from the previously recommended program for handling urgent requests, as well as on a survey of available data from the NYSILL program, showing the origin of photocopy requests.

R6. In the future, messenger service should in all cases be provided to deliver facsimile transmitted copy from receiving stations to originating libraries. When facsimile transmission equipment is used, mail or even less-than-immediate public library system delivery should not be permitted as one of the links in the network.

R7. Before the start of any new FACTS program, the State Library should review in detail the procedures and operations of the network with all personnel that will be involved in the program at each facsimile station and request transmission site.

R8. The initial stages of future FACTS projects should be devoted to learning the tasks and procedures necessary to the proper functioning of the network. Data collection should be introduced only after operations have become a matter of routine. From the beginning of the current FACTS program, staffs at the transmission sites and the State Library were burdened with collecting data that lengthened each request that was submitted by an estimated two or three typewriter lines.

R9. Finally, it would seem more appropriate at this stage of library development in New York State to concentrate funds on projects aimed at the development of a master plan for reference and research interlibrary loan service rather than at the more sophisticated but less fundamental services. These projects should include those leading to basic improvements in the NYSILL program, such as might accrue from refinements in the subject library coverage or from the preparation of a detailed system for the local classification of requests--urgent and otherwise--as a guide to the State Library's referral process.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

FACTS AND NYSILL DATA SHEET

REQUEST NO. 1	AUTHOR 2	TITLE 3

PERIODICAL OR PUBLISHER 4	VOLUME 5	ISSUE NO 6	DATE 7	PAGES 8	PATRON STATUS 9 S F O I

REFERENCE VERIFICATION 10	ORIGINATING LIBRARY 11	DATE REC 12	TIME REC 13	MEDIA 14 T TWX M IP O	STATUS 15 NIL NOS

RTS 16	SUBJECT 17	DATE REC 18	TIME REC 19	MEDIA 20 T TWX M O	STATUS 21 NIL NOS WNS	N Y S L		DATE REC 22	TIME REC 23	MEDIA 24 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 25 NIL NOS WNS C
ARC 26	FEE 27	DATE REC 28	TIME REC 29	MEDIA 30 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 31 NIL NOS WNS C	SRC 32	FEE 33	DATE REC 34	TIME REC 35	MEDIA 36 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 37 NIL NOS WNS C
REFERRAL SITE 38	FEE 39	DATE REC 40	TIME REC 41	MEDIA 42 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 43 NIL NOS WNS C	REFERRAL SITE 44	FEE 45	DATE REC 46	TIME REC 47	MEDIA 48 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 49 NIL NOS WNS C
REFERRAL SITE 50	FEE 51	DATE REC 52	TIME REC 53	MEDIA 54 T TWX FAX M O	STATUS 55 NIL NOS WNS C	FACTS RECEPTION SITE 56	DATE REC 57	TIME REC 58	PAGES COPIED 59	TIME REQUIRED 60	TOTAL FEE 61

TYPE OF REQUEST 62 FAX BV P	TYPE OF MATERIAL 63 MO SER	FINAL STATUS 64 C NF

NYSILL AND
FACTS REQUEST
FORM

3/22/67

LEGEND

ARC - AREA REFERRAL CENTER
BV - BOUND VOLUME
C - COMPLETED
F - FACULTY
FAX - FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I - INELIGIBLE
IP - IN PERSON
M - MAIL
MO - MONOGRAPH
NF - NOT FOUND
NIL - NOT IN LIBRARY
NOS - NOT ON SHELF
O - OTHER
P - PHOTOCOPY
RTS - REQUEST TRANSMISSION
S - STUDENT
SER - SERIAL
SRC - SUBJECT REFERRAL CENTER
T - TELEPHONE
TWX - TELETYPE
WNS - WILL NOT SEND

Appendix B

GUIDELINES FOR THE FACTS AND NYSILL PILOT PROJECTS IN NEW YORK STATE

March 20, 1967

Foreword

The New York State Library announces two pilot programs to strengthen its services to the readers of New York State.

In order to provide speedier interlibrary loan materials needed for serious purposes, we have established a facsimile transmission experiment known as FACTS.

The second and allied program is designed to provide materials for readers not available to them through their local library, library system, or at the New York State Library. This program to furnish materials to the research community of New York State is known as NYSILL, the New York State Interlibrary Loan Network. The State Library hopes by providing these networks and through contracts with major research libraries to make quickly accessible to the research needs of the State more data than has hitherto been possible. We have entered into contracts with three major public libraries, to be known as Area Referral Centers, to supply material not found at the State Library; and as a further step we have entered into contract with eight research libraries to provide material through interlibrary loan in designated subject fields.

The contracting libraries are:

A. Area Referral Centers
   1. Brooklyn Public Library
   2. Rochester Public Library (Monroe County Library System)
   3. Buffalo and Erie County Public Library System

B. Subject Referral Centers
   1. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Library
   2. The Engineering Societies Library
   3. The New York Academy of Medicine
   4. Union Theological Seminary
   5. Teachers College
   6. Cornell University Libraries
   7. Columbia University Libraries
   8. The New York Public Library

Section I

Describes the specifications for referrals within the NYSILL and FACTS networks

1. To avail itself of the resources of NYSILL's contracting libraries in the referral network the originating library should assume some judgemental responsibility for determining the seriousness of an inquirer's request. The New York State Library will code as ineligible for further referral the requests from persons under 18 years of age and from the inmates of mental or penal institutions.

The resources of the New York State Library itself will continue to be available to all citizens.

2. All requests must contain an accurate bibliographic citation of the material desired.

3. All photocopies or facsimiles of material under copyright limitations will be reproduced only once per requester and stamped with "Reproduced by single copy transmission for reference purposes only. Further reproduction is not authorized."

4. No contracts have been negotiated for the loan of fiction. Requests for fiction will be handled by the New York State Library within the limitations of its own collection.

5. The originating library whose request is filled by facsimile or photocopy may charge the inquirer for that request a fee not in excess of that currently charged at the originating library for photocopying. The monies received in this manner will remain at the originating library. No attempt will be made to transfer these funds to the library filling the request.

6. Each contracting referral library or FACTS station shall keep such statistics and reports as the State Library shall request in order to evaluate the projects and monitor the cost.

7. Each contracting area referral center, subject referral center, and FACTS station shall have a professional person, designated by the librarian of that institution, to supervise the operation of network functions carried on at the site, provide for adequate record keeping, and maintain liaison with the Division of Library Development.

Section II

Describes the operation procedures which pertain to the contracting libraries in NYSILL

1. The contract with Area Referral and Subject Referral Centers is for a period of six months, ending August 31, 1967.

2. The referral library center shall not Xerocopy more than 24 pages for one request.

3. The referral library center shall retain the right to set its own limits on the nature and number of materials to be lent to NYSILL, to decide when to send photocopy instead of the original.

4. The contracting referral library center will not be expected to mail materials to readers living within approximately 60 miles of the center, unless it is their present policy to do so, or unless there are extenuating circumstances as in the case of a physically handicapped reader.

5. Payments to contracting libraries will be made on the following *schedule:*

    5.1 Participation Payment - Paid one month after signing of the contract. Each of the Area Referral Centers shall receive $3,500. Each of the Subject Referral Centers shall receive an amount ranging from $1,750 to $5,000 as based upon expectations of referrals.

    5.2 Unit Referral Payment - Paid quarterly. Each Area Referral Center shall receive $1 for each referral unit. Each Subject Referral Center shall receive $2.50 for each referral unit.

    5.3 Services Rendered Payment - Paid quarterly. Each Area Referral Center and each Subject Referral Center shall receive $2 for each referral unit filled.

6. An accepted code for interlibrary loan will be further refined and developed as part of the six months project.

7. Participating contracting institutions are free to expend the total amount received in any way they see fit.

8. It is estimated that approximately 25,000 requests will be referred by the New York State Library to the network of 11 contracting referral libraries by the end of the six months period.

9. It is expected that the Brooklyn Public Library may become a clearing center for both Queens and the New York Public Library Circulation Department within the year, so at the first, no separate contract will be made with Queens or New York Public Library, until the pattern of inter-system loan becomes clearer in New York City.

Section III

Describes the Procedural Specifications for the Use of the Facsimile Transmission Network, FACTS

1. Material transmitted may be taken from any format capable of being copied by the equipment.

2. The length of the transmitted material will not exceed 12 copied pages. This figure may be modified on the basis of experience gained from the initial operation of the project.

3. A FACTS site must possess a reproduction machine capable of producing copies which can legibly be transmitted over the network.

4. An efficient plan of serving readers should be jointly developed in each region. The site must be willing to provide delivery to designated points within the immediate area. These points will be decided by the local Reference and Research Library Resources group or a representative body of librarians from the area. The objective is service to the reader within 24 hours of request inside the immediate area. It would be at the discretion of the installation site as to what the most efficient method of transmitting materials would be for readers within the site's region, yet outside the immediate area of 24 hour service.

5. All libraries of a medical nature within the immediate delivery area should be included on the delivery route with full borrowing privileges.

6. Libraries of profit-making organizations should be informed of the availability of the service and asked to provide their own messenger system.

7. Further decisions on network inclusion should be made by the local Reference and Research Library Resources group or a representative body of librarians from the area.

8. The Division of Library Development will absorb all technical and mechanical expenses of the network. This includes equipment and line rental, installation costs, maintenance fees, and supporting supply expenditures. Recompense will be made for reproduction expenses incurred by a

sending site in generating copy for transmittal purposes. The rate to be paid will be the actual cost of running the copies and not the fee charged to an outside patron for such service.

9. The Division of Library Development will pay participation institutions, for the purpose of securing hourly clerical help to operate the equipment during the term of the pilot project and for the rental of additional copying machines, the sum of $1,000 per installed machine at the site.

10. It is expected that each institution having a FACTS installation will develop an adequate delivery service in consultation with the area Library Reference and Research Resources System and that the cost of such delivery service will be paid from the Library Reference and Research Resources System's funds.

March 22, 1967

PROCEDURE FOR REQUESTING INTERLIBRARY LOAN BY TELETYPE FROM NEW YORK STATE LIBRARY

A library Requesting an Interlibrary Loan from the State Library will:

1. Dial for regular ILL requests: 710-441-8254 or 710-441-8255
   Dial for FACTS requests: 710-441-8238.

2. Identify itself and give date. For numbering, we will use format now used on regular teletype requests. The teletypewriter message will be prefaced by the coded name of the library (see attached code sheet for this purpose). Requests will be alphabetized and then sequentially numbered by month and prefixed by the month number as in the following example:

   For April 3, 1967 -
   FLLS 4-3 Padelford, Norman, Regional organization of the United Nations. International Organization vol. 8, May, 1954, pp. 203-216 (F) Int. Ind. Berkshire Free Lib., Berkshire, Tioga, 13736, 3/31/67 3:30 (O) NIL 3-1 3/31/67 4:30 (T) NIL

   Each TWX request will be separated by a four space interval from the succeeding request.

There will be no pre-assigned time schedule for FACTS requests, on 710-441-8328. NYSILL requests will be batched into pre-assembled time sectors as noted on coding sheet. The pilot experiments, however, will be governed by certain user and data limitations.
Soecifically -

a. Borrowing library should assume responsibility for determining seriousness of a patron's request, but in general, no person under 18 years of age, or an inmate of a mental or penal institution should be allowed to request materials.

b. Material transmitted must be based on a request containing an accurate bibliographic citation.

c. Length of transmitted material, in the case of FACTS, will not exceed 12 copies pages per request. Material to be photocopied for NYSILL requests will not exceed 24 pages.

d. All requests should, if at all possible, be verified. FACTS requests must be verified. Verification indicates that the form of entry of a request is correct and not the contents cited.

March 22, 1967

THE ROLE OF THE REFERRAL CENTERS IN THE NEW YORK STATE INTERLIBRARY LOAN NETWORK AND FACTS SYSTEM

The State Library will transmit to an area or subject referral center via TWX a full bibliographic description of the request plus an identifying number, reference verification information, the name and address of the originating library, and a subject designation.

The referral sites will, upon receipt of a request transmitted from the State Library,

1. Initiate a search for the material requested.
2. Report to the New York State Library via TWX
    a. The status of the request.
    b. If the request can be filled, how is it to be done, i.e., by FACTS, by mailing a bound volume, or by mailing photocopy.

March 22, 1967

Subject areas Assigned to Each of the Designated Subject Referral Centers

Africa 1-20
Agriculture 3-5
American Literature 2-7
Anthropology 2-15
Astronomy 1-18
Bibliography 3-4
Botany 3-6
Canadian History 1-9
Chemistry 3-3
China 2-13
Classical History 2-2
Classical Languages 2-4
Economics 1-12
Education 5-1
Engineering 7-1
English History 1-3
English Literature 1-17
Fine Arts 6-1
French History 1-1
French Literature 2-5
Geography 1-11
Geology 1-22
German History 1-2
German Literature 2-8
India/Pakistan 3-10
Italian History 1-4
Italian Literature 2-6
Japan 2-12
Journalism 2-3
Latin American History 1-10
Law-Anglo American 3-8
Law-Foreign 2-10
Mathematics 2-9
Medicine 4-2
Middle East 1-21
Modern European Language 1-15
Music 1-23
Netherlands History 1-7
Patents 1-19
Philosophy 2-1
Physics 3-2
Political Science 3-1
Psychology 4-1
Religion 8-1
Scandinavian History 1-6
Slavic 2-11
Sociology 1-14
South Eastern Asia 3-9
Spanish History 1-5
Spanish Literature 1-16
Technical Reports 2-14
Technology 7-2
Transportation 1-13
U. S. History 1-8
Zoology 3-7

The code consists of an initial number which indicates the responsible subject referral center, i.e. 1 = NYPL, 2 = Columbia, 3 = Cornell, 4 = New York Academy of Medicine, 5 = Teachers College, 6 = Metropolitan Museum of Art, 7 = Engineering Society, 8 = Union Theological Seminary. The second number is merely the order in which subjects appear under each of the subject referral centers.

March 22, 1967

Request Transmission Sites

Public Library Systems	TWX Code
Brooklyn Public Library	BPL
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	BECL
Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Library System	CCLS
Chemung-Southern Tier Library System	STLS
Clinton-Essex-Franklin Library	CEF
Finger Lakes Library System	FLLS
Four County Library System	4CLS
Mid-Hudson Libraries	MHLS
Mid-York Library System	MYLS
Mohawk Valley Library Association	MVLA
Nassau Library System	NLS
New York Public Library	NYPL
Nioga Library System	NIOGA
North Country Library System	NCLS
Onondaga Library System	OLS
Pioneer Library System	PLS
Queens Borough Public Library	QBPL
Ramapo Catskill Library System	RCLS
Southern Adirondack Library System	SALS
Suffolk Cooperative Library System	SLS
Upper Hudson Library Federation	UHLF
Westchester Library System	WLS

3R Groups	
Capitol District Library Council for Reference and Research Resources	CAP
Central New York	CNY
Cornell-Southern Tier	COR
Long Island Library Resources Council	LIC
New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency	MET
North Country Reference and Research Resources Council	NCRR
Rochester Regional Library Council	RRLC
Southeastern (N.Y.) Library Resources Council	SENY
Western New York Library Resources Council	WNY

FACTS Stations	TWX Code
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library	BECL
Columbia University	COL
Cornell University	C.U.
Mid-Hudson Libraries	MHLS
Mid-York Library System	MYLS
Monroe County Library System (Pioneer Lib. Sys.)	MCLS (PLS)
Nassau Library System	NLS
New York Public Library	NYPL
New York State Library	NYSL
SUNY at Albany	SUNY-A
SUNY at Binghamton	SUNY-Bi
SUNY at Potsdam	SUC-Ptsd
Suffolk Cooperative Library System	SLS
Westchester Library System	WLS

March 22, 1967

New York State Interlibrary Loan Network
and
FACTS Transmission Form and Procedures

Requests will come to the switching center at the State Library in two forms, either by TWX or by mail. Requests to be filled by FACTS will have to be transmitted via TWX (710 441 8238). Requests to be filled by NYSILL may be submitted either by TWX (710 441 8255, 710 441 8254) or mail. The content of TWX requests and mail requests are described below.

A. TWX Requests

Stations sending requests for interlibrary loan will supply the following information. Appropriate appendices and further explanatory data will be sent to all applicable libraries within the State.

Name of Library (See attached codes)

Date

Request number. This consists of a number indicating the month the request is being submitted in, i.e., 1 for January, 2 for February, etc.; hyphen followed by the sequential number of the request for that day. A sample request for the first request of April would be 4-1.

Author

Title

Periodical or publisher

Volume

Issue Number

Date

Pages

Patron Status i.e. "S" for college or university student
"F" for college or university faculty
"O" for other
"I" for ineligible. (Request from patrons restricted from participation in FACTS or NYSILL by parameters set forth in the guidelines controlling the networks)

Reference verification indicates that form of entry, not content, has been verified. Verification is to be provided whenever possible. It is mandatory for FACTS requests. If verification is not possible, please indicate by using symbol "NV."

Originating library (Name and address, including county). This is the library where patron initially submitted his request.

Date request received at originating library

Time request received at originating library

Media through which received at originating library, i.e.

T: Telephone
TWS: Teletype
M: Mail
IP: In person
O: Other

Status in originating library, i.e. NIL: Not in library
NOS: Not on shelves

Subject (To be assigned from attached subject designation code)

Date request received at transmission center

Time request received at transmission cneter

Media - T-Telephone - TWX-Teletype - O-Other - M-Mail

Status at Request Transmission Center,
i.e. NIL - Not in library
NOS - Not on shelf
WNS - Will not send

B. Mail request will be submitted on the regular interlibrary loan form supplied by the State Library. Please add the County to the Library's address.

Please code the following information on author and title requests in the box for subject requests on the back of the form.

1 Patron status S - Student
F - Faculty
O - Other
I - Ineligible

2 Reference Verification

3 Status in originating library, i.e. NIL - Not in library
NOS - Not on shelves

4 Media by which request was received - T - Telephone
M - Mail
O - Other
IP - In person

WNR (will not refer)

(1) Beyond NYSL
- (A) Requests for books and periodicals when the patron status is ineligible
- (B) Requests for books and periodicals when the correct interlibrary loan referral form is not used
- (C) Requests for fiction
- (D) Requests for Arco type books
- (E) Requests for books available in paperbook
- (F) Requests for Books which the system and NYSL will not send
- (G) Requests for books which are new and in popular demand
- (H) Requests for textbooks
- (I) Requests for children's books

(2) Beyond ARC
- (A) Requests for books which are in the subject areas assigned to NYPL (This library will send a maximum of 24 pages in answer to a request)
- (B) Requests for books for which no subject code is given

Appendix C

FACTS POSTCARD-QUESTIONNAIRE

REQUEST NO. ________

We would appreciate your assistance in collecting data about this history-making venture in the facsimile transmission of library materials by filling out and mailing this postcard. This will facilitate evaluation of the program.

The New York State Library

TO BE ANSWERED BY LIBRARIAN:

1. When did you receive this material? ________ (time) ________ (date)
2. How did you receive it? ☐ Mail ☐ System delivery or messenger ☐ Other (please specify) ________

TO BE ANSWERED BY PATRON:

1. Did you request material by author and/or title? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, is this the material you requested? ☐ Yes ☐ No
2. Is this material satisfactory for your needs? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If no, why not? ________
3. When did you receive this material? ________ (time) ________ (date)
   How? ☐ Picked it up at library ☐ Mail ☐ Messenger ☐ Other (please specify) ________
4. Were you notified that the material had arrived at the library? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes: how? ☐ Mail ☐ Telephone ☐ Other (please specify) ________
   when? ________ (time) ________ (date)
5. How will you use this material? ☐ Business or professional activities ☐ Academic course work ☐ Independent research ☐ Other (please specify) ________
6. Were you aware of the facsimile service before you made your request? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, would you have submitted your request even if the facsimile service were not available? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Would this service be equally useful if it took 2 or 3 days longer to receive the material? ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Have you suggestions for improvement of service? ________